CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

CAIUS GRACCHUS AND OPIMIUS,

IN REFERENCE TO THE

American Society

FOR COLONIZING THE

Free People of Colour of the United States.

First published in the Richmond Enquirer.

Georgetown, D. C.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY JAMES C. DUNN.

1827.

THE following Note is in reply to one asking the consent of *Caius Gracchus* to this publication.

AMELIA, DECEMBER 1st, 1826.

SIR: My neighbour, Mr. Penick, having communicated to me your request, that "Caius Gracchus would consent that his numbers should be published in a pamphlet form with those of Opimius," I have to say in reply, that I can certainly have no objection to their re-publication in the manner desired: for although given to the public under the pressure of continued professional engagements, yet they are now public property; and you have my free consent to dispose of them in any way that your own candour and justice may lead you to adopt: with an assurance at the same time, that whilst I have freely canvassed the wisdom and policy of your scheme of colonization, I have at all times admitted the goodness of the motives in which it originated.

Very respectfully,

Your obedient Servant.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

CAIUS GRACCHUS AND OPIMIUS.

To the President and Members of the Auxiliary Colonization Society of Powhatan.

GENTLEMEN: The recent organization of your Society in my vicinity, has attracted a degree of attention on my part, to the principles and objects of your Institution, which I had not given to the subject, while similar associations were springing up at a greater distance from me. For, although at all times sensible of the extreme delicacy of the subject upon which you propose to exert your beneficence, I had not believed that an Association avowedly founded on private charity alone, and seeking to effect its object through the medium of a Colony, to be planted on a distant and barbarous coast, would ever for a long while engage the serious attention of the American people. I was induced, therefore, to consider the parent Association at Washington, when it was first gotten up in 1816, (although sanctioned by some very imposing names,) as the effusion of that general desire to ameliorate the condition of man, which prevails in such a peculiar degree in our own country; and which, while it is admitted to be the offspring of some of the finest feelings of the human heart, and has often been the means of the attainment of great public blessings, has yet, not unfrequently, eventuated in the projection of schemes, abortive in principle and fraught with the most disastrous consequences both to the public and to individuals. Regarding your parent Association at Washington in this point of view, I could well do justice to the good feelings of most of its projectors, at the same moment that I indulged the belief that it would have only an ephemeral existence. But the persevering

efforts of some of its members, coupled with a spirit of fanaticism, which is equally calculated to amuse the fancies and to alarm the fears of society, have been so successfully exerted, as to procure the establishment of numerous affiliated Societies throughout the country. It hence, becomes a matter of the deepest interest on the part of the slave-owners of the South, carefully to examine not only the principles and policy of your Association, but all the consequences which will probably grow out of it, to the peace and happiness of our slave population. And if, instead of the mild workings of a disinterested philanthropy, seeking only the promotion of human happiness, there should be found lurking in its train a viper, whose sting is to poison every source of domestic quietude, and to wrap our country in misery: none will hesitate to accord to it, the doom which must sooner or later await it. Under these impressions then, I beg leave to submit to your Society, and to the people of Virginia at large, my own apprehensions and reflections upon this subject; and will, therefore, suggest for consideration the following topics:

1st. Is the scheme of planting a distant Colony, by means of private charity alone, practicable?

2dly. Is it the object of the Association to rely upon charity alone? or rather, do they not in reality look for the aid and patronage of the Federal Government? And if so, upon what principles *of right, or policy*, is such aid to be afforded?

3dly. Is it not also, an avowed object of the Association, to produce throughout the Union a total extinction of slavery, as well as to colonize the present free blacks of the country?

And 4thly. What are likely to be the horrible consequences upon our slaves, by the public discussion of such topics, in sermons and other public harangues?

Each of these topics in detail, shall receive from me a brief and respectful consideration.

1st. Is the scheme of planting a distant Colony, by means of private charity alone, practicable?

At the threshold of any remarks upon this subject, it may, I think, be very safely affirmed, that the history of the world affords no example of the kind: And that there is not in human affairs generally, a more difficult undertaking than that of planting a distant Colony, even under the most favourable auspices, and when aided and protected by the government of the parent country. If any thing was want-

ing to prove the truth of this remark, let reference be had to the history of the early settlement of the Colonies in North America; in relation to which we have the lights of authentic history.* In every instance that is recollected, of an attempt to plant a Colony, either in North or South America, the government of the parent country had both an interest and an agency in the enterprise. And while it is believed, that commercial cupidity has, in general, been the most fruitful source of planting distant Colonies; yet in every case, the sovereign jurisdiction over the new Colony has been retained and asserted by the government of the parent country; which, in turn, was under the obligation to give it protection. And whether this protection in all cases, may have been afforded in the best way, it is not now material to inquire; but it is believed in all successful attempts, to have been extended in some form or other, and to a greater or lesser extent in all. But in the case under consideration, *charity! cold charity!* it is alleged, is to supply, not only the means of inducing emigration on the part of the free blacks, many of whom are comfortably and prosperously settled among us, but after emigration, is also to supply the necessary succour, maintenance and government. And all this, too, for the mere abstract love of indulging the exercise of that heavenly quality.

I submit it to the sober and reflecting part of society to determine, after the experience of the world in this business of planting colonies; led on and directed as they generally have been, by commercial enterprise and sagacity; and sheltered under the protection of the government to which they belong, whether this scheme of planting a Colony, out of the worst of materials, upon a distant and barbarous coast, under a tropical climate, where incessant rains prevail for a large portion of the year, by the contributions of mere charity, be either feasible or rational.

Let the history of the world admonish us upon this subject. How often, under the most favourable auspices, have we seen infant colonies reduced to the greatest extremities of human suffering by accident, disease, famine and other calamities. And how often also, have we seen them, from similar causes, wholly destroyed, leaving scarcely a vestige of their infant settlements behind them. And are the re-

* If any gentleman wishes to be informed of the many abortive attempts and the great difficulties which beset the first Colonists in North America, let him consult the histories of the New England Colonies by Belknap, Hutchinson and Minot; and in particular the early histories of our own state by Mr. Stith and Mr. Beverley.

flecting part of society, at this day to be informed, that private charity is always unsteady and irregular in its contributions, and never to be relied on for the purpose of sustaining any uniform and extensive system of expenditure?—Charity may be safely appealed to, for the purpose of founding a hospital, a free school, or of contributing to the immediate wants of the poor in other respects, by whom we may be surrounded; but when season after season is to bring with it a renewal of its calls, without being able to look forward to any determinate period when they are to end, he, indeed, must be little versed in the human character, who would not perceive that many of its calls would be made in vain. Check then, for a single season, the supplies necessary to sustain your infant Colony, and what is their condition? Disease, starvation and death. Are there no accidents, too, to be apprehended from the infidelity of Agents, in the administration of your funds; from their want of skill, admitting them all to be honest: nothing from the insubordinate and wretched character of the population composing the Colony? Is there nothing, too, to be apprehended from the incursions of the barbarous tribes, by which your settlement is surrounded; from whom your infant Colony, if I mistake not, has already received one or two pretty formidable attacks? If so, I pray you to recollect that all these misfortunes are to be repaired by private charity; and that too, perhaps, after charity shall have become tired of giving.

Let me not be told by the fanatical admirers of this charity scheme, of the successful efforts of the "African Institution" of London, in planting the present British Colony at Sierra Leone; of their public schools; of the number of African youths which they have in a course of instruction; of the good police of their *Free Town*, or their *Regent's Town;* or, if you please, of the present extent of the whole population of the Colony. These things, I know, have been assiduously thrust into almost every Annual Report of the parent Society, and every magazine whose columns could be pressed into the service. But, unfortunately, the history of this Colony furnishes, if not conclusive, at least pretty strong evidence of the truth of the proposition now under consideration: That private charity is inadequate in itself to the success of your enterprise. For without professing, to have a minute acquaintance with its history, at every stage of its advancement; this general fact is sufficient to be known, that from the foundation of the Colony, at Sierra Leone, in 1786, up to about 1806 or 1807, it remained under the direction

of the private Association by whom it was first established. That from the latter period, it was taken by the British Government into their own hands; and has so remained up to the present time. That as late as the year 1803, seventeen years after its foundation, we find the following account of its condition at that period, given by Mr. Jefferson, in a letter written by him at a subsequent time, to John Lynd, Esq. Speaking of an application which had been made through Mr. King, our Minister at London, to the African Society, to ascertain their willingness to receive Colonists from the United States; he says, "he (Mr. King) "opened a correspondence with Mr W— and Mr. Thorn-"ton, Secretary of the Company, on the subject; and in 1803, "I received through Mr. King the result, which was, *that "the Colony was going on in but a languishing condition; "that the funds of the Company were likely to fail, as they re-"ceived no return of profit to keep them up; that they were "then in treaty with the Government to take the establishment "off their hands;* but that in no event should they be willing "to receive more of these people from the United States, "who by their idleness and turbulence, had kept the settle-"ment in constant danger of dissolution." In a subsequent part of the same letter, he says, "I think I learned after-"wards, that the British Government had taken the Colo-"ny into their own hands, and believe it still exists." Here, then, is pretty strong evidence of the fact, that while private charity and individual exertion alone sustained the Colony, it drooped and languished, and was fast approaching dissolution, when its fate was only arrested by the policy of the British Government in taking it into their own hands; no doubt operated on by commercial cupidity, and her well known desire to extend her colonial dominions in every quarter of the globe. Many adventitious circumstances at this moment, too, conspire to make this little Colony a sort of favourite bantling with the British Government; among others there is known to exist a sort of *passion*, on the part of some members of the British Government, upon the subject of slavery and the slave trade. Hence the royal munificence and bounty of the Government in favour of this little Colony.

But apart from all general reasoning upon this subject, let us see whether we are not warranted in this belief, from the proceedings of the Society, and the opinions of some of its most distinguished members, that the better informed among themselves do not consider the contributions of

charity alone as sufficient for their object; and that they are in fact, looking for protection from the Federal Government. For that purpose, I would beg leave to introduce the following extract of a speech, delivered by Gen. Robert Goodloe Harper, before the parent Society at Washington, in February, 1824, upon a proposition to petition Congress for aid in their behalf. "I hold it," says the General, "perfectly clear, from what has come to my knowledge of "the progress of this, and all similar establishments, that "no means within the possession of this, or any other *pri-* "*vate Association*, are adequate to the attainment of those ob- "jects which such an Association ought to hold in view." This, then, is the language of one of the Vice-Presidents of the parent Association, eight years after the Society was first founded. But let us hear further upon this subject from the President of the Society himself; and for that purpose I would call your attention to the following extracts from Judge Bushrod Washington's address to the Society, delivered in January, 1820, and prefixed to the third Annual Report of its proceedings. "The sentiments and wishes," says the President, "of those who were the objects of our "solicitude, were to be ascertained, the public mind was "to be enlightened, and the co-operation of our fellow- "citizens secured by satisfying them, that the plan of the "Society was both wise and practicable; *and the power, aid,* "*and patronage of the National Government was to be sought* "*for and obtained.*" In another part of the same address, he makes the following observations. "All that now re- "mains to be accomplished, is *to obtain the countenance and* "*aid of the National Government* in such manner, and to "such extent, as Congress in its wisdom may think expe- "dient." And finally, in the close of the same address, he says, "I submit it therefore to the consideration of the So- "ciety, whether it may not be proper to appoint a Com- "mittee, to bring this subject to the view of the present "Congress, and to advocate the claims, which the unfortu- "nate class of men in whose cause we are engaged, have "upon the justice, the humanity, and the magnanimity of "the National Government." Without adducing other proofs, it appears to be pretty manifest, from the foregoing extracts, that the better informed part of the parent Association do in fact admit, that charity in itself is unequal to the accomplishment of your purpose, and that it will be indispensably necessary to your success to invoke *the aid and patronage* of the "National Government," as they have been pleased to term it.

This view of the subject directly leads me to the examination of the second topic which I have suggested for your consideration. And here permit me to inquire in what manner, and under what provision of the Federal Constitution it is that *the aid and patronage* of the Federal Government is to be bestowed? Is it, like the British Government, to take your settlement at *Liberia* into their own hands and to establish upon the coast of Africa a *permanent Colony?* Or is it by a vote direct to lavish upon you the public treasure. Either of which I have no hesitation in affirming, would be equally unconstitutional and impolitic. But waiving for the present all remarks upon the policy of holding distant Colonies, as being at war with the interests of a Republic; known to be as they always have been the most fruitful sources of foreign wars; I would respectfully ask, where is the power under the Federal Constitution for the Government of the United States to hold any people or any country as a *permanent Colony* of the General Government?—Congress has power to admit new states into the Union.—It has also the power of acquiring territory with a view to that object, as was solemnly determined by the Government in the case of Louisiana. But that acquisition must be made with a bona fide intention of admitting the territory and people thus acquired into the great family of the Republic, upon the attainment of a proper degree of maturity, and not to be held as a permanent Colony. Here, then, let me pause for a moment and emphatically ask, does there live a a man so blinded by fanaticism and folly as to wish to see the Federal Union extended beyond the Atlantic to the Western shores of Africa, to embrace a population already deemed so vile by the votaries of this scheme as to be unfit to live among us? I presume not. Let us then see under what power it is that you would ask Congress for a direct vote of the public money. Is it upon the belief that they have the right of doing general deeds of charity? If so, I am happy to be yet a stranger to such a provision of the Constitution. Or is it, that like some other acts of that body, you would have them shelter it under some of the implied powers? If so, then indeed I may have been labouring under wrong impressions upon this subject. Perhaps in this way you may find a cover for it, under that all-comprehensive power which authorizes Congress to "provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States," if you can be successful in convincing that body of the policy of your scheme. But I will not allow myself to believe that the

Government of my country will thus act; notwithstanding all the sickly sensibilities and mistaken impressions which are known to exist upon the subject of slavery on the part of a large class of politicians in this country. I will not for a moment think that even the wildest of these latitudinarians could be induced to break the holy barriers of the Constitution to legislate on such a subject. A subject at once difficult, delicate and awful in all the consequences which will flow from an unrighteous interference with it.

Believing the subject of this communication to be one of the deepest interest to my fellow-citizens, I shall pursue it in a subsequent number with an eye to the two remaining topics which have not yet been considered.

CAIUS GRACCHUS.

To the President and Members of the Auxiliary Colonization Society of Powhatan.

GENTLEMEN: In pursuance of the intimation which I gave you in my former communication, I beg leave now to pursue the examination of your scheme in relation to the two remaining topics which I there stated for consideration. And while I take pleasure in acknowledging my own opinion of the amiable motives and feelings which dictated the plan of your parent Association, I shall, nevertheless, take the liberty of discussing with freedom, the wisdom and policy of the measure, and of denouncing in suitable terms all the mischiefs and evils which I think must inevitably grow out of a perseverance in your purpose.

Is it then true, that it is *one of the objects of your Society to produce a general emancipation of slavery throughout the United States*, as well as to colonize the present free blacks of the country? If so, permit me to ask, have you properly considered the importance, the difficulty and delicacy of your enterprise? Have you duly estimated the means by which this great revolution in the population of the South is to be effected? In a word, have you well considered all the political and social consequences which are to grow out of it? If you have, your minds have been led to a very different result from any opinions of my own; or, what I believe, must be the opinions of a majority of the reflecting people of this country, after your scheme shall have been properly considered. But

lest I should be charged with imputing to your Society an object which the style of your Association does not imply, nor the provisions of your constitution declare, and which I believe but few suspect you of entertaining, I consider it my duty in the first place, to fix this purpose upon you: and with that view, I shall here introduce a portion of evidence of the most unequivocal character; and which, I presume, will at least be regarded by you as good authority, as it is derived from your own files. Let us then consult, in the first place, the 3d Annual Report of the parent Association at Washington, page 29, in which will be found the following sentence: "For although it is believed, and is indeed too obvious to require proof, that the colonization of the free people of colour alone, would not only tend to civilize Africa, to abolish the slave trade, and greatly to advance their own happiness, but to promote that also of the other classes of society, the proprietors and their slaves; *yet the hope of the gradual and utter abolition of slavery, in a manner consistent with the rights, interests and happiness of society, ought never to be abandoned.*" Again, in page 98 of the same Report, Appendix G., will be found the following extract from the address of the President to the Society upon the same subject: "The effect of this Institution, if its prosperity shall equal our wishes, will be alike propitious to every interest of our domestic society; *and should it lead, as we may fairly hope it will, to the slow but gradual abolition of slavery,* it will wipe from our political institutions the only blot which stains them; and in the palliation of which we shall not be at liberty to plead the excuse of moral necessity, *until we shall have honestly exerted all the means which we possess for its extinction.*" Here then is a pretty distinct expression of your object in this respect from the highest sources. But I will not content myself with this only, but show from the declarations of some of your most distinguished votaries, that such is well understood among them to be one of the prominent objects of your Association. For this purpose I must again refer to the same page of the same Report, Appendix G., for the following extract of a letter written by General Robert Goodloe Harper, lately one of its Vice-Presidents, to the Secretary of the Society at Washington. "Great, however, as the benefits are, which we may promise ourselves from the colonization of the free people of colour, by its tendency to prevent the discontent and corruption of our slaves, and to secure to them a better treatment by rendering them more worthy of it, *there is another advantage infinitely greater in*

every point of view, to which it may lead the way. It tends, and may powerfully tend, to rid us gradually and entirely in the United States of slaves and slavery; a great moral and political evil of increasing virulence and extent, from which much mischief is now felt, and very great calamity in future is justly apprehended. It is in this point of view, I confess, that your scheme of colonization must strongly recommend itself, in my opinion, to attention and support." But this is not all. Let us see with what eagerness this object of your Society is caught at by our brethren to the North, whose misguided zeal, and fanaticism upon a late memorable occasion in Congress,* excited a storm whose dreadful forebodings distinctly announced this as one of the most dangerous subjects upon which the government, or the people of this country could be called on to act. And for that purpose I would beg leave to call your attention to the following extracts, from the Report of the Committee appointed at Boston, Sept. 7th, 1822, to consult about the expediency of affording aid to the Colonization Society; and which will be found appended to the 6th Annual Report of your parent Association at Washington, pages 49 and 50.—"Were the objects of this Society," say the Committee, "extended no farther than the colonization of such people of colour in our own country as are already free, or who will become free in the ordinary course of events, they would not in the view of the Committee, be such *as to excite that deep interest among us*, which is necessary to secure a very active co-operation;" and after enumerating its probable effects in the civilization of Africa, and an extension of the principles of Christianity, it further says: "But if while these purposes are accomplished, the colonization of the free people of colour will aid effectually in the suppression of the slave trade, *so as to lead to the entire abolition of that detestable traffic, and at the same time afford such encouragement to the emancipation of slaves, as to prepare the way for the gradual extermination of slavery, it would become an object worthy of the attention and assistance of the whole Christian world. And that such are the designs and expectations of those* who are most active in managing the concerns of the American Colonization Society, the Committee have the fullest confidence." Again, in a subsequent part of the same Report, the Committee expressly declare, that "It is only from the belief which the Committee very cordially entertain, that the active members of the American

* The Missouri Question.

Colonization Society, are perfectly disposed to frame their measures with reference to the entire suppression of the slave trade, and to a gradual and prudent, *but complete emancipation of those* now held in slavery, that we can regard the Society as having any claim upon the sympathy or assistance of the people of New England." Here then, I presume, the measure of proof must be considered by all as complete. And is it, in reality one of the objects of your Society to effect the emancipation of the slaves of the South? Pause, I beseech you, and reflect for a moment on the magnitude and design of this subject. Divest yourselves, if you can, of every feeling of fanaticism, and regard this as a sheer political question. No matter how slow, how gradual, or how insidious may be your movements to the attainment of such an object, be assured you can never be successful. In your efforts you may be able to cherish in the country a feeling intimately connected with that sectional jealousy which has already began to rear its Gorgon front in the federal councils. You may be able to excite in the bosoms of the southern slaves, a spirit of discontent and insubordination, which, while it will endanger the happiness of the fairest portion of the Union, will only serve to draw closer the bonds of slavery; and to realize a great and signal example of the folly of seeking after unattainable perfection.

But let us suppress for a moment the feelings, which naturally arise upon the contemplation of such an enterprise, and examine attentively the means by which it is proposed to effect it. And as far as I have been informed, only two modes have been suggested; the one is by a great moral influence which is to be exerted over the opinions and feelings of the South, and the other by means of the same moral principle, with the "aid and countenance of the National Government." We will then briefly consider the prospect of success likely to attend both operations. First, as to the moral principle alone. And to render this successful, you must convince the American people that you will be able to establish your proposed Colony by means of charity only.—2d. If charity itself should not be adequate to such an object, then that the Federal Government has the constitutional right either to do deeds of charity for you, or to establish *and keep up a permanent Colony of free negroes* on the coast of Africa: or, in the 3d place, that it is good policy on the part of our Government, to take this Colony in the Federal Union, and make it an integral part thereof. 4th. To induce the people of the United States voluntarily and for

charity sake, to surrender one million and a half of slaves. 5th. To overcome the individual habits, pride and prejudices of twelve states. And finally, after all this is effected, to be able to prevail on, by proper inducements, this million and a half of slaves, made free men, voluntarily to quit the country; and also, to perpetuate to them and their posterity a republican form of government for the Colony after it falls into their hands: as not to secure to them this blessing, would be but an exchange of masters, and that of a white master for a black one. Without enumerating other difficulties, I submit it to the calm and reflecting part of my countrymen, to determine upon the probability of so successfully exerting any moral principle, as to overcome all the great difficulties which I have stated. Already, I think, has it been shown, in my former communication, that charity alone cannot successfully plant your Colony; and also, that the aid which you invoke from the "National Government" in planting the Colony, cannot in any form be constitutionally afforded you. But suppose for a moment, that I have been wrong in all my previous opinions and reasoning upon the constitutional powers of the Federal Government: also, as to the extent to which charity can be successful, and that your Colony at Liberia is now at maturity, and able to sustain itself without foreign aid. Yet, in relation to the *emancipating* part of your scheme, the great difficulty still exists. How are you to invert the order of human nature, and to render that ruling passion, *self-interest*, and the love of wealth so wholly inoperative as to secure the voluntary surrender of three hundred millions of dollars, which is the estimated value of 1,500,000 slaves at $200 each? If I mistake not, there is not a principle of human conduct that can with so much safety be counted on in the enaction of laws, or the adoption of any scheme of policy, as self-interest and the love of property. Do not these attributes of the human character, of themselves, seem to present an insuperable difficulty to the attainment of your wishes? But even this obstacle, as formidable as it certainly is, offers not an hundredth part of the difficulties you will have to encounter in your attempt to revolutionize the whole character and habits of the people of the South:—habits which have so long and so generally obtained as to have become almost incorporated with our very existence. Even our bodies, as well as our minds, have been moulded under the influence of this principle of labour among us; and that which was first a habit has become constitutional. Added to all these considerations,

there is a peculiarity in the love which most masters entertain for their slaves, that does not apply to any other species of property. Few of us who own slaves at all, that have not among them some which were the gift of our fathers, who have been raised with us from infancy to manhood, and shared with us in all the pastimes and amusements of youth; receiving from us good fellowship at that age, and a share of every little delicacy that parental kindness could lavish upon us. Some, too, there are among them who may have watched over our childhood as nurses, and taught us to indulge a feeling of kindness towards them, that no time or circumstances can ever eradicate. To all these considerations, too, may be superadded the peculiar cast of character in the South, which the ownership of slaves has certainly had a great tendency to produce. Proud, high-spirited and independent, the love of freedom, and a jealousy of any invasion of their rights, either individually or politically, have ever, I think, been distinguishing attributes of the Virginia and Southern character. Over such a population, with such habits, feelings and interests, what moral principle, short of a *miracle* itself, could work the desired change? None, I am sure, which obtains in the management of human affairs. Let us, then, see in what manner the "countenance and aid of the National Government," in co-operation with this principle, is to be exerted. We have already seen that under the Constitution, the Federal Government has no right to hold a *permanent Colony*, or to do general deeds of charity. But supposing your Colony to be established without it, has it then a right to take any steps either directly or indirectly to aid you in the emancipation of the Southern slaves? Need I refer you to the 2d section of the 1st article of the Federal Constitution, by which it is declared, that "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians, three-fifths of all other persons"? Without referring to other portions of the same instrument, in which the existence of slavery is solemnly recognised, I would here ask, how is this business of *emancipation* to be effected without breaking up the very foundations upon which the existence of this "National Government" depends? Is it, then, only by the destruction of the principle of the Constitution, aided by the workings of a MIRACLE, that your object in this respect can

be effected? Is it not worthy of remark, too, (as we have been recently told by Mr. Mercer, in one of his late attacks upon the good old Constitution and respectability of his native state,) that this very principle of the Constitution which I have quoted, was introduced into that instrument by the *management* of Brother Jonathan, whose sensibilities of late, have been so deeply affected by the existence of slavery among us.

Without pursuing this constitutional inquiry further, permit me to assure you, gentlemen, that there are many very well-informed politicans in this country, and good philanthropists too, who have not been able to see all the horrors in Southern slavery which some of the busy votaries of your scheme have imagined. They believe, and upon well grounded information, that the great mass of the slaves in the United States, particularly in Virginia, are better fed, better clothed, and enjoy more real happiness, than the labouring class in any of the governments of Europe. That as the native African character has been improved in the persons of their descendants who have been reared among us, it has been the policy of the Virginians, as it will be of the citizens of all other States similarly situated, to adopt milder means for their government. Hence, the great and increasing amelioration of the laws of Virginia upon this subject. They believe, as philanthropists too, that the sum of human happiness consists in small matters; and that so far as the individual happiness of the negroes is concerned, there is much reason to believe, that were they successfully planted in your African Colony, their condition would not be bettered. In the indulgence of this opinion, they cannot overlook the fact, that the greatest risk of life must in all cases be incurred in a removal from the healthy climate of the United States, of any native, to the coast of Africa. It is known, too, that when your Colony shall have swelled a little more in population, (if it ever should,) it will not be competent for your charitable Board at Washington, consisting of twelve Managers and a Resident Agent, at the distance of 3 000 miles, with the Atlantic rolling between you, to manage such a population by any means within your control; and that the consequence will be, the establishment of an independent government for themselves. And what would be, in such an event, the form of their civil polity, let the history of the world inform you. If the French people, claiming to be the most refined nation in Europe, at the commencement of their Revolution, had too recently emerged

from a condition of political slavery, to be able to sustain a republican form of government in their country, can it be doubted that any thing short of a high-handed military despotism, would be adequate to curb the insubordinate and dissolute population of a Colony made up of emancipated slaves?

Many wise and virtuous men there are, too, who doubt the success of your enterprise, in civilizing the nations of Africa. If the history of the world be appealed to upon this subject, I presume it would admonish you of the fact, that wherever the settlements of civilized man have obtained, the native inhabitants of the woods have always receded.—Without adducing other examples, witness the result of the European settlements in America, and the British settlements in the East Indies. Witness the daily operation of things upon our own Western frontier, where every exertion of a liberal and humane policy has been unable to arrest this natural course of events. If the same immutable laws of nature should still obtain, what will the poor degraded and savage inhabitants of Africa have gained by your exertions? Nothing but extermination.

But, it is furthermore said by your votaries, that the existence of African slavery among us is not compatible with the free character of our republican institutions; but has also a tendency to demoralize their owners. In regard to the first part of the objection, it may very truly be said to be an objection consisting more in terms and in sound, than in any evil influence which it exerts in the government. And for the truth of the remark, allow me to appeal to facts with which most of us are familiar. In what portion of the Union will you find a more independent, high-spirited people; jealous of their civil and religious rights, ever prompt and ready to expose the abuses of government, than the people of the South. And without meaning to press invidious comparisons between different parts of the Union, farther than the task has been imposed upon me, allow me to ask, in what section of the United States is it, that we most frequently hear the application and use of those servile terms of address: "The Honorable Mr.——, member of Congress, &c. &c." "His Excellency the Governor, &c. &c. &c." and all the other terms of courtly distinction? Not in Virginia, or the Southern States, to the same ridiculous extent to which they obtain in the North, I am sure. It is in the non-slave-holding states where these and other marks of distinction are most frequently to be met with. Look to your Federal Government, now

and at all times heretofore, for men of liberal sentiments upon the subject of civil liberty, and I presume the South will have no occasion to decline a comparison with the North. Is there no instruction, too, upon this subject, to be derived from the history of two of the freest States in ancient times? Look to the Republics of Rome and Lacædemon; in both of which, during the proudest days of their freedom, private slavery was tolerated. And permit me, in conclusion upon this branch of the subject, to assure you, that in all civilized countries which have ever yet existed, there have been, and always must be, a labouring class. There must be "hewers of wood, and drawers of water." And if there be not a particular description of persons, as in the Southern States, by whom those duties are to be performed, they must be drawn from the great bulk of the population of the country; the result of which is well known both in Europe and in the non-slave-holding States of America.

Those who perform these menial duties, in their intercourse with their employers, are almost as servile as the Southern slave: and while they are admitted, by the forms of their Government, to an equality of civil rights, form a separate and distinct class from their wealthy employers. This state of things has a direct tendency to produce a real aristocracy in society, founded upon the possession of wealth, the most odious of all distinctions. Hence, it may safely be affirmed, that whatever may be the fact in regard to the whole population of a state, including both black and white; yet, as it respects the white population, slavery has a natural tendency to produce a greater degree of equality, than exists in States where slavery is unknown.

I would here gladly close this communication, and leave the consideration of the evils which must inevitably flow from the public discussion of such topics to your own reflections; but I am admonished by past experience, that correct reflection upon this subject, is slow in coming; and, perhaps, may only come after the horrors which I deprecate shall actually have overtaken the country. Pardon me, then, gentlemen, when I tell you, that you have embarked in a crusade, more hopeless than that which engaged the forces of all Christendom, without success, for nearly two centuries. The God of Nature has fixed his seal upon destiny; and all the feeble efforts of man, in opposition to its laws, will only serve to swell the list of human miseries. Prompted by the goadings of a blind fanaticism, which seems already to have placed itself in close alliance with you, this, which is a sheer politi-

cal question, may be tortured into a theme for pulpit declamation. Once let it obtain a place there, and the Christian religion, which has so many claims upon the favourable consideration of the world, and which has heretofore sustained itself in our happy land, regardless of political agitations, will be made the medium of one of the severest scourges of the American people. It is well known to the reflecting part of mankind, that more or less of fanaticism is certain to attach itself to every political subject, which is placed in alliance with the Church. Hence the wisdom of that principle of American politics, which forbids the union of Church and State.

But I forbear to press this view of the subject farther. I feel too deeply penetrated with the conviction, that however misguided your efforts, and chimerical your views, the motives which impel to exertion, are good. But good motives will not be a sufficient atonement for your follies, when you may have lighted the faggot which is to communicate a flame, that will destroy the peace and happiness of half the United States; and which will carry in its train every species of horror, and visit alike its miseries upon the master and the slave. CAIUS GRACCHUS.

To Bushrod Washington, Esq. President of the American Colonization Society.

Sir: The high character which you sustain in the country, as well as your office as President of the American Colonization Society, would have indicated you in the first place as the proper person to be addressed, in any remarks upon the principles and objects of your Association, had I not been influenced by a wish to arrest the progress of a growing mischief, which had already approached the limits of my own threshold. It was for that reason only, that my two former communications were addressed to the President and Members of the Auxiliary Society of Powhatan. I now beg leave, however, to redeem myself from this apparent neglect, and to offer to you some small token of my recollection of the part which you are acting in this mischievous affair; in which I shall terminate, for the present, any further discussion of this subject, after having very briefly pointed out *the progress* and *the alarming tendency* of the doctrines which your Society is now engaged in propagating through the land.

I do not expect to be able to change your opinions upon this subject, or to make a proselyte of you, by any efforts of mine. Many considerations exist to prevent the indulgence of such a hope. For, while all unite in according to you an unsullied private character, you are known to hold opinions in regard to the powers of the Federal Constitution and upon the subject of slavery, which have long placed you in concert with those most unfriendly to the interests of the slave-holding States. The public avowal of these opinions, and the compliments which have been so handsomely paid you, by placing you at the head of the parent Association, must convince me how vain would be the attempt to overthrow an *old man's opinions*, thus supported by his pride and his prejudices. It is possible too, sir, in the discharge of this duty, I may indulge in a freedom of remark, and a rigour of examination, not altogether reconcileable with the quiet of your feelings, and of those with whom you are acting. But, I beg you to be assured, that I shall not wantonly and unnecessarily seek to inflict pain or uneasiness upon you. But when principles and objects are avowed, which threaten the destruction of the peace and happiness of half the Union; and for the attainment of which, the Federal Constitution itself is to be violated, it becomes the duty of every good citizen, not only to denounce the *mischief*, but to point the finger of censure and disapprobation at the *authors themselves*. And should you suffer from so unpleasant a distinction, your reflection must be, that its correction is at all times in your own hands.

Bear with me then, sir, while I trace the progress of this mischievous sentiment, which has recently manifested itself in such excess of sensibility at the existence of Southern slavery: and, while I mark its advances from the smallest beginnings, down to the present period, when sheltering itself under the sacred forms of religion and the auspices of your Society, it is now actively engaged in scattering the seeds of misery and disunion in the country, with all the concert and effect which organized associations can give it.

In the contemplation of this subject, it will be a source of no little instruction to us, to take a brief view of the state of public sentiment, upon the subject of slavery, as it existed at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and from thence, up to the period of the establishment of your Society; and to contrast the harmony and general tranquillity which obtained in all parts of the Union, upon this subject, with the alarming doctrines, and excited sensibility, which

Missing Page!

Missing Page!

point out the pernicious effects of the free negro population on our slaves, he closes by these further remarks:—"He would conclude by saying, that he had thought it necessary to make these remarks, being a slave-holder himself; to show *that so far from being connected with the abolition of slavery,* the measure proposed would prove one of the greatest securities to enable the master to keep in possession his own property" But this is not all.

Mr. Francis Key (of the District, and one of the present Managers of the Society) "*Suggested that with a view to exempt the object of the meeting from the possibility of misapprehension, there should be inserted in the resolves, an express disclamation of any intention of the proposed Association, to touch the question of the abolition of slavery.*" The Chairman, Mr. Clay, "remarked, that such a clause would better enter into the articles of the Association when formed." To which Mr. Key assented.

After such an unequivocal and solemn disclaim, by the founders of your Institution, of any intention to interfere with the subject of slavery, what must be the astonishment of all reflecting men, when they perceive your Society in its corporate character, and your numerous votaries in their widespread operations through the country, within the short space of a few years, openly avowing and propagating doctrines leading directly to the general abolition of slavery? Shall I be again called on to furnish the proof that this is one of your objects? Already has that most unpleasant duty been performed, in my last communication to the Auxiliary Society of Powhatan. But if further proof is wanted, let me refer you to a whole chapter under the head of Appendix G. attached to the 3d Annual Report of your Society: gravely penned and made up of different extracts, from the speeches and communications of your members, to prove that this was one of your objects. Let me refer you too, to the notorious and distressing fact, that your subordinate Agents are at this moment penetrating society in all directions, inculcating these pernicious doctrines, under the solemn and sacred sanctions of religious obligation. It is in vain for us to be told that your Society does not seek to impose any direct obligation on the slave-owner to emancipate his slaves; but that your aim is to effect this object gradually, and by the exertion of a great moral principle to be created among us. This, when we consider the peculiar character and temper of this portion of our population, is no palliation of the mischief. Not even fanaticism itself, would be rash enough to

attempt by direct means, the general abolition of slavery. The peculiar constitution of society in the South, and the safeguards which the Constitution and laws have thrown around this portion of our property, must at least for the present render any movement of this sort, both physically and legally impracticable It would seem, then, that your Society is entitled to but little credit for seeking to effect your object in the only mode which was left for your choice. But, sir, it is from your *efforts in this very mode of operation, in attempting to create a great moral principle in society, favourable to emancipation*, that all the horrible consequences which I deprecate, are likely to result. And, when we contemplate its inevitable consequences upon our slave population. it is, if any thing, more objectionable than a direct movement to your object; for, while the one would lead inevitably to open war, the other leads as certainly to the most horrible species of assassination. Your public and private discussions of this interesting question, however honestly they may be intended for the moral edification and improvement of the whites, will not fail to engage a much greater degree of attention from the slaves, than from all other portions of society, for the most obvious of all reasons, because to them it is a question of liberty or slavery. Goaded up to a state of phrenzy by your fanatical inspirations, their hopes and feelings would but illy brook the necessary delay for the successful establishment of your favorite moral principle in the minds of their masters. Degraded and debased from the very knowledge of their condition as slaves, dissolute and abandoned in their moral character, with passions and feelings of the most lawless and brutal kind; rendered more than combustible by inflated pictures of liberty and the recollections of past servitude, a single spark would be sufficient to throw the whole country into a flame, whose ravages would extend themselves into every walk of society. Our fields, our kitchens, and even the sacred retreat of our chambers would contribute the materials to feed this unholy conflagration.

But let me turn from this appalling scene of misery, which is destined to grow out of your efforts to revolutionize public sentiment upon this subject, and see if it is not also true, that there is much reason to believe, that your Society from its very nature and tendency, (especially since the interpolation of the abolition principle into its proceedings,) has already been, and is calculated to become, in future, the repository of all the fanatical spirits in the country upon this sub-

ject; and whether the late political movements to which I have had allusion, being subsequent to the establishment of your Society, have not a close moral, if not real connection with you. It cannot be expected that these propositions should be sustained by the same definite and precise proof, as that which has been adduced to show the rapid encroachments of your Society, since its first organization: because, from the very nature of things, they are not susceptible of it. But, I believe, enough has already been developed in your operations, to produce the most satisfactory impressions of their correctness. First, then, as to its tendency to become the rallying point of all the restless and disaffected upon the subject of slavery. No other proof upon this branch of the inquiry can be necessary, but the fact just noticed, that when your Society was first formed, *its sole object was said to be the colonization of the free people of colour*, in which I believe your founders to have been sincere. Yet, in the space of a few years, it is seen avowing principles and objects, which look to the general abolition of slavery throughout the United States. This extraordinary change can only be accounted for in two modes, either that your founders were insincere in their declarations, and were actually practising a fraud upon the community, (which I will not allow myself to believe,) or that my conclusion is correct: and that the principle of abolition, since interpolated, is a vice inherent in the nature of all such Associations. Experience then, the only true standard of correct reasoning, seems to settle this question between us, and renders all abstract argument upon it unnecessary. One remark, however, cannot be forborne. It must be apparent to every man, that the same feeling and sensibility, which would lead any set of men to devise plans for the amelioration of the condition of the free people of colour, (if to colonize, is in fact to ameliorate,) would naturally, and almost by necessary consequence, show itself, in behalf of a still more degraded portion of our fellow-men; those who were in bondage. The one picture could not be contemplated without also seeing the other. They belong to the same species, have a common origin, and live in the same society. Thus it is, when the human heart is once set on bleeding from any object of distress, either real or imaginary, it often with indiscreet tenderness, embraces subjects which judgment subsequently condemns. This is the case with conscientious men upon this subject, and what I have in charity to your judgment, imputed to you. But, sir, there is a more unpleasant view of this subject, with which you

are compelled to be informed, and which has not even the excuse of good motives, or good feelings. There is known to exist to a considerable extent in the non-slave-holding States, a sentiment unfriendly to this principle of servitude among us, growing out of the prejudices of education, and an ignorance of the actual condition of slavery among us; aggravated in many instances by sectional and political considerations. Men operated on by such feelings, could not fail to perceive the natural tendency of such institutions to the promotion of their views, and now, that the abolition principle is avowed, must flock to your standard in the full conviction of receiving a hearty and wide-spread co-operation by means of a regularly organized corps, leagued together by a common purpose.*

I will now ask your attention very briefly to the extraordinary effort made in Congress to impose an unconstitutional and most wicked restraint upon the new State of Missouri; to the subsequent resolutions of Messrs. King and Tucker in the Senate and House of Representatives, seeking by covert advances to engage the Federal Government in acts of legislation upon this subject. I do not propose to trouble you with any argument either upon the character or constitutionality of these topics. This would be unnecessary; because the united voice of the whole community, (with the exception of the votaries of abolition) has accorded them a fate, which it is hoped will ever render them harmless and inoffensive. But they have been summoned to your recollection for another purpose: To prove that doctrines and opinions of that character never dared to intrude themselves into the acts of Federal Legislation, and to assume the form of grave propositions in Congress, until subsequent to the establishment of your Society in the country; and that although I may not have the means of establishing a clear concert and connection between these political movements, and the operations of your Society, yet the

* *Note.*—See the Report of the Committee at Boston upon this subject, dated the 7th day of September, 1822; extracts from which were quoted in my last communication to the Auxiliary Society in Powhatan; also the following resolution of the Legislature of Connecticut, recently adopted:

"Resolved by this Assembly, that the existence of slavery in the United States of America is a great national evil, and that the people and states ought to participate in the burthen and duties of removing it, by all just and prudent measures which may be adopted, with a due regard to their internal peace and mutual harmony; and that a system of colonization under the patronage of the National Government, may reasonably be deemed conducive to so desirable an object."

periods and circumstances under which they have occurred, leave the impression that they owe their origin to the countenance and support which your Society is giving to such doctrines, and that there is a strong *moral* connection between you. I pass over, too, Sir, without further remark, the indelicate and pragmatical interference of the Legislatures of New Jersey and Ohio, in their resolutions of recent date, recommending to the Southern States the abolition of slavery; except only, to call your attention to the period at which they have occurred, and as tending to show the danger with which we are threatened upon this subject, both by enemies at home and abroad.

I might now, sir, almost venture, in conclusion, to appeal to your own candour and ask, if there can be a doubt about the civil character and tendency of the Institution over which you preside: Or the rapid advances it has made in its encroachments upon the subject of slavery, within the short space of a few years; and finally, if the slave-holders of the South have not much reason for their apprehension that there exists a connection and dependence between those odious political movements, first noticed, and the operations of your Society? And if these things, or any of them, be true, how can you longer reconcile it to yourself, as a patriot and a Virginian, to remain at the head of such an Institution, and give to its operations all the sanction of your name and character? Believe me, sir, you will best consult your own true glory and the happiness of your country, by a magnanimous avowal of your disappointment in its supposed benefits to the community, and an acknowledgment that the whole subject of our coloured population, whether bond or free, is one perfectly anomalous, and of the most delicate and difficult character; and that it cannot be interfered with, either by Fanatical Clubs, or the Federal Government, without the inevitable risk of tearing asunder the bonds of that political Union, which has been alike the boast and happiness of Americans and the admiration of the world. But if your Society should still persevere in its objects, and the Federal Government be betrayed into any interference with this portion of our property, you will have only to remember, that there is sufficient intelligence in the South to understand their rights, and chivalry enough to defend them.

CAIUS GRACCHUS.

To Caius Gracchus:

You have passed judgment in a cause which you have not heared.—Alarmed at what you deem an approaching evil, you have remembered that indiscreet efforts to do good, may be mischievous; but have forgotten that an indiscreet opposition to such efforts, may be equally so. You have, without sufficient inquiry, attacked a man, who, if he has lent such a name, and such an influence as his, to a work that shall result in the consequences you apprehend, will, (besides having much to lose) have much to answer for to his country.

You have attacked a Society which commenced its labours under the high encouragement of an almost unanimous resolution of the Virginia Legislature, and whose progress has been sanctioned by the approbation of patriots and statesmen of unquestioned discernment.

Had you applied for information and explanation, and suggested your fears, even to the respected individual whom you have denounced, or to any of those who have been engaged in the operations of this Society, you would, I hope, (for I am disposed to think you fair and candid,) have found yourself relieved from your apprehensions, and would have acknowledged that this difficult and delicate subject was, at least. safe in their hands.—You would have seen full cause to separate them from the rash and intemperate projectors with whom you have unjustly associated them; and would have deemed it no small advantage, if the influence and example of this Society could have formed "*a nucleus,*" *around* which, the "*disorderly* and disaffected had gathered," instead of rushing upon the doubtful and dangerous adventures of which you complain. Whether the justification, I am now attempting, will afford you this relief; whether, having committed yourself upon the question, both with your neighbours and the public, the "pride of opinion" will be too strong for it, I cannot determine. I fear, from an observation in your letter, that the Society has incurred your displeasure, not more by any inconsistency in its course, than by having commenced it, and that when I shall have repelled the charge of deviation from its original purpose, the purpose itself will be the subject of attack, as containing "a vice inherent in its nature," leading to all the mischiefs you have imagined.

This purpose, to which the Society's labours were declared to be "exclusively directed," is the "removal of the free coloured people of the United States to the coast of Africa, with their own consent."

Is this a purpose so inherently vicious in its nature, so calculated to "excite extraordinary political movements," to affect "the proceedings of the Federal and State Legislatures upon subjects of the most alarming and dangerous character"—"to throw the whole country into a flame, whose ravages would extend themselves into every walk of society, our fields and our kitchens"? Or is it one which may be fairly, faithfully and safely prosecuted ?

This question I might leave to be settled by authority. The legislators of Virginia saw no such dangerous tendency in it, when they recommended it; nor afterwards, when they removed the injunction of secrecy, under which they had considered and decided it. The man you have named, and many others, distinguished alike for prudence and for patriotism; Southern men, interested deeply, every way, in the question: who were present and parties in the formation of the Society, saw no such dangers. Doubts of success were felt and expressed by many, but that it was a measure to give alarm to the slave-holder, was imagined by none.

The fact is, that the only alarm it gave was to the ultra-abolitionists. The slave-holders were the only first friends of the Society: the abolitionists, its only enemies. They saw nothing of this "inherent vice." While you consider it necessarily fraught with danger to the slave-holder, they take it for a selfish scheme to make slavery more safe and profitable, and deem it fatal to the slave. The nature of a purpose, capable of such opposite misconstructions, must lie in the safe middle course between such errors, and be innocent. If you have examined this subject as you ought, and consulted the publications of the period to which I allude, you will acknowledge the correctness of what I state.

I contend, then, that the original design of the Institution was, at least, harmless—that it might be prosecuted and ought to have been prosecuted without mischief. But I will do more—I will prove that for nearly ten years it has been so prosecuted. And this brings me to consider, what is at present your main ground of accusation—the inconsistency of the Society in departing from their original design.

And now, sir, I must insist that we discuss this matter fairly and closely. It will not do to charge upon the Society without the shadow of proof, every thing that has ever disturbed you upon this subject, from the debates in Congress and in State Legislatures, down to the supposed whispers of supposed emissaries, and sub-agents.

You must have seen the Society through a strange medium

of alarm, to have imagined that the Missouri Question arose at their bidding, that the Legislatures of Connecticut and Ohio were excited by their influence, and Messrs. King and Tucker moved by their instigations. Believe me, you are wholly wrong in these suspicions. The Missouri Question came upon you from the North, where we had scarcely a friend: and I cannot recollect a single member or friend of the Society who was not with you on the question. As to Messrs. King and Tucker, I do not believe that either of them has ever had any intercourse with the Society, or even approves of its views.

Your reasons for charging these matters to our account are as singular as the charge.

You say they occurred since the formation of the Society, and that Congress had never dared to discuss such matters before. This I admit, and only say we could not help it, and promise that never hereafter shall Congress discuss any such matters, with our leave.

And you also say, that "these movements owed their origin to the countenance and support which our Society is giving to such doctrines." And this we deny, and call upon you to say where and when the Society gave any countenance and support to the doctrines of the Missouri Question, or the motions of Messrs. King and Tucker? But I am really almost ashamed to be thought serious in thinking you serious, in attributing these great political movements to so inadequate a cause. I cannot, however, forbear to state that the Society has presented, on different occasions, three or four memorials to Congress, and one to the Legislatures of Maryland and Virginia; and in these, I should presume, if any where, would be found the incendiary doctrines with which you charge us; yet, in these, you have found nothing; and are yourself forced to admit that you do not sustain this part of your case with "such definite and precise proof, as has been adduced to show the rapid encroachments of the Society since its first organization."

Let us come, then, to the "definite and precise proof." First, what is the charge? The Society departs from its originally avowed purpose of only labouring for the removal of the free coloured people, and "in its corporate character, and by its numerous votaries in their wide-spread operations through the country, openly avows and propagates doctrines leading directly to the general abolition of slavery."

The proof offered to support this accusation, as respects the Society, is "a whole chapter under head of Appendix G.

attached to the third Annual Report of the Society, gravely penned and made up of different extracts, from the speeches and communications of the members, to prove that this (viz. the general abolition of slavery) was one of their objects."

Now here is a definite charge; Appendix G. contains "doctrines leading directly to the general abolition of slavery," and was "written to prove that that was one of the Society's objects."

The doctrines contained in this chapter will be found to be nothing more than an avowal of the Society's original purpose and a fair defence of it. I know that you consider this purpose as "leading directly to the general abolition of slavery;" but so thought none of those who formed it; and no disclaimer of the Society could surely be so construed as to prohibit them from a prosecution of the very purpose for which they had associated. The article begins with an extract from a speech of Mr. Clay's at the first annual meeting, which, it is true, speaks of emancipation and the prohibitory laws of the States; but Mr. Clay had not so soon forgotten the extract of his speech which you quote, nor can there be discerned the least inconsistency between the two extracts. In Mr. Jefferson's letter there is nothing alarming, and nothing that had not been published, without any objection being made to it, years before the Society was formed. Then follow extracts from addresses made to the Society by Judge Washington and Mr. Mercer, and from a letter of Mr. Harper's to the Secretary. These gentlemen, or some of them, express their hopes and expectations of certain consequences which may result from the labours of the Society: they do this in mild language, and on suitable and safe occasions, among themselves; nor do they do this unnecessarily or to establish or propagate any other doctrine than that for which they were associated. Surely if they could be allowed to avow and prosecute their object, they had a fair right to defend their object and to show its advantages. Suppose them attacked by an opponent like yourself, who thought the prosecution of their object dangerous, and that they meant to alarm the public by schemes of abolition? Might they not reply that they prosecuted no such scheme; that they were only to labour for the removal of the free, and that those who were unwilling to emancipate would be benefited by their success? If still urged with the objection, that their purpose led to emancipation, might they not reply, that if it did, emancipation connected with removal would then be safe and salutary? And suppose them

attacked (as they were) by others who declared their design to be selfish and only calculated to make "servitude more secure and rigorous;" might they not defend themselves in the manner done in this Appendix, and show that their object, if attained, would benefit those who were willing but unable to emancipate? And might not the Society, finding it necessary to reply to such objections, do so with perfect firmness, consistency and safety? We are now trying the charge of departure from an original purpose; and if this supposed departure is a just defence of themselves and a fair prosecution of their purpose, it is no departure: and you are driven to impeach the propriety of the purpose as your only ground. This Appendix is declared to be penned and published because it had been charged (page 99) "that in the constitution and proceedings of the Society, or in the avowed sentiments of its members, there can be discerned nothing friendly to the abolition, &c." and "in order to justify (page 102) the Society from the charge of a mere selfish design to dismiss the free, that the remainder may be held in a more secure and rigorous servitude." In making this defence, a more safe and prudent course could not be adopted, more temperate and mild language could not be used. Every appeal to passion or to legislation is not only avoided, but discouraged and disavowed, and it is published in the Appendix to a pretty considerable volume, not intended for general sale or circulation, but discreetly distributed. Of the same character, and entitled to the same justification, are the various passages referred to in your letter to the Society of Powhatan. They are all consistent with a fair prosecution of the Society's original purpose; they were necessary to its prosecution, and consequently prove no change of course or object.

As to what has been done by those you call "the Votaries of the Society," I am not bound to answer. You consider Congress, the State Legislatures, the Abolition Societies, and all who write or speak on these subjects, as votaries. I tell you, you are mistaken. If any of these votaries do, as you say, "openly avow and propagate, in their wide-spread operations through the country, doctrines leading directly to the general abolition of slavery," we can only say we have never heard of it, and have given them neither authority nor encouragement to do so.

Whatever others may think and do, the Colonization Society understands the true and delicate nature of the business in which they have engaged. Its Managers are almost all

slave-holders, and feel and know, and admit. that the utmost caution and prudence are essential in their measures. Had they been the wild fanatics you suppose them, pursuing the mad and dangerous designs you attribute to them, with the rashness, indiscretion and inconsistency with which you charge them, I ask you, whether, in nearly ten years, some fruits of their folly would not be found to appear? I demand of you whether in such a time, such an instrument (having too, as you suppose, vast influence in Congress and in the States, and "actively engaged in scattering the seeds of misery and disunion in the country, with all the concert and effect that organized associations can give it,") can have so forgotten or neglected its business, as now only, to have alarmed you only ? while the enlightened Legislature of Virginia, in the very midst of these terrifying operations, instead of seeking to arrest the evil, and punish the evildoers, give them (as they did only a year ago) aid and encouragement ? I aver then that the Society has acted wisely and prudently, and I prove it by showing that they have acted innocently and safely—I appeal to the existing state of things, which could not be peaceful and secure as it is, if there was any real ground for your charges. I appeal to the continued and increasing confidence of an enlightened community, justly vigilant upon this subject, which could not have been gained without having in some measure deserved it.

I readily acknowledge that there are many well-meaning persons, who engage in various enterprises relating to this interesting and difficult subject, in a way to justify your apprehensions, and pursue a course that must be admitted to be dangerous. It is very easy to be misled by falling into error in this way, as I hope to show you. One advantage of the Colonization Society is, that they draw off many of these mistaken, but honest men, from wild and dangerous pursuits, to adopt the object of the Society, and engage in what is more safe. That far more correct, rational, and temperate views are now gaining ground in the North, must be admitted: and it may be hoped, that many of those whom you now consider our votaries, may really become so, and relinquishing the various operations that excite your apprehensions, unite with us in endeavouring to accomplish an object, which awakens neither dangerous hopes nor fears.

That you may have more charity for the errors of others, I beg to show you one of your own.—You urge that the most dangerous doctrines and opinions are avowed and published by the Society,—and you re-publish them most particularly,

accompanied with comments, showing very strongly, how they are dangerous, and what consequences may be apprehended from them.

Might I not have asked, can you believe this? Is the publication so mischievous and alarming, and the *re*-publication, after a space of five years, in which they had done no mischief, nothing? Was it so dangerous to express in a select audience, these opinions, and to print and distribute them in a book, circulated with care; and is it nothing, when they are forgotten and at rest, to call them forth again, and giving force and point to them, by the plainest comments, to place them on the wings of every wind, and send them wherever a newspaper can be wafted?

I do not doubt your sincerity,—your uneasiness was real, —but in the heat and indiscretion of feeling, you have done what is more dangerous and alarming than the most unguarded word or deed of any member of the Society.

I say this in candour,—such publications as that of your's, in the newspapers, ought to be forborne. Call on us, inter nos, when you think we are imprudent, and we will hear you with respect;—and show that any part of our course is even doubtful, as to its safety, and we will renounce it.

A Member of A. C. S.

To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer.

My attention had but just been called by a friend to the numbers of Caius Gracchus, on the subject of the Colonization Society, published in August last, when your paper of the 11th inst. brought me the very uncourteous appeal of the same writer, to the Hon. Bushrod Washington, President of the Society. In undertaking to reply to the specious arguments, and to correct the numerous errors which mark the essays of your correspondent, I rely on the excellence of the cause I wish to serve, rather than on any false opinion of my own ability to compete with a writer, distinguished, not less, by the ingenuity of his deductions, than by the classical purity of his style. I could have wished, indeed, that the vindication of the views and the operations of the Society, had fallen into other hands. I should then have been gratified with another instance of the supremacy of truth, without being obliged myself, to engage in a controversy as foreign to my disposition, as it is inconsistent with the ordinary avocations of my life.

The correct result, at which your correspondent has arrived, as to the intention of the Colonization Society, ultimately to rely on the powers and the resources of the National Government, for the accomplishment of the great purposes for which its humble efforts have been designed only to prepare the way, supersedes the necessity of any reply to that part of his argument intended to show the total inadequacy of private charity to a scheme so vast and so magnificent. Private charity has already accomplished nearly all that was expected from it. It has enabled a few disinterested but not undistinguished individuals to demonstrate, that with the most limited resources, a colony might be planted, and successfully maintained on the coast of Africa. And, what is of still more importance, it has furnished abundant means for awakening the public mind to the necessity of an early attention to a subject, that, sooner or later, must force itself, most painfully, perhaps, on the attention of a very large proportion of our community. By the faithful, and the successful use of the means that have been thus furnished, the Society feels itself justified in making immediate application to the Government of the country, for aid and protection; and it rests its hopes of success, in an honest conviction, not only that the object to be accomplished, is intimately connected with the "common defence, and the general welfare" of the nation, but that the means for its accomplishment have been abundantly supplied in the delegated powers of the Government, and that their exercise on the present occasion, will be in strict accordance with the uniform practice of every administration. In sustaining these several propositions, I trust I shall be able to furnish a suitable reply to the multiplied, and sometimes irreconcileable arguments of Caius Gracchus.

Whoever is at all conversant with the character of the free coloured population of our country, must be satisfied that it is a source of evil rather than of good to us. The very limited addition which it makes to the labour of the country, is more than counterbalanced, not only by its extraordinary deductions from the gross amount of that labour, but by the indolence and the immorality inseparable from its condition; by the distinctions which it creates in our society as well as in our laws; and above all, by the paralyzing influence which it must necessarily exercise over the physical energies of the nation. In the slave-holding portions of our country, this balance of evil is infinitely increased by the effect of an intermediate class of population. such as that

we are considering, on the relations subsisting between the master and the slave. Made up, for the most part, either of slaves or of their immediate descendants, elevated above the class from which it has sprung, only by its exemption from domestic restraint, and effectually debarred by the law, from every prospect of equality with the actual freemen of the country; it is a source of perpetual uneasiness to the master, and of envy and corruption to the slave. Its effect is to diminish the comfort of the one, while it increases the burthens of the other; and to leave to the society, in which it exists, no other security than can be derived from an arbitrary system of laws, not less revolting to humanity, than inconsistent with the general character of our institutions.

That these are no ordinary evils—that, however unequal they may be in their operations, they are, nevertheless, general and national in their effects—and that their removal would contribute essentially to "the common defence and the general welfare," are truths which your correspondent will hardly venture to deny. And, whatever, may be his own opinion as to the power of the General Government to expend its money on objects, merely because of their connection with "the common defence and the general welfare," a recurrence to his memory alone, will satisfy him, that the power has been conceded by a large proportion of the wisest and best men of our country, and has been sustained by the uniform practice of every administration from the first to the last. How else will he account for the appropriations made for the purchase of Louisiana and Florida? for the repeated acquisitions of Indian Territory—for ameliorating the condition of the savages—for relieving the distressed inhabitants of Caraccas—for restoring captured Africans to the homes from which they have been torn—for the suppression of the slave trade—for the promotion of Internal Improvement—and above all, for the late act of grateful munificence to the venerable La Fayette? None of them can be brought within the enumerated powers of the Government; and in the school to which Caius Gracchus evidently belongs, but few of them would be admitted among the means "necessary and proper" for the execution of enumerated powers. They are all, however, conducive, either directly or indirectly, to "the common defence" or "the general welfare." This alone has designated them as fit and proper objects to be accomplished. And it has been solemnly "decided," that the power of appropriation was sufficiently comprehensive to embrace them within its terms. Let the removal of the free people of co-

bour from the country be tried by the same principles. Let it be examined in its relation to the general interests of the nation, and it will not suffer in comparison with the most favourite of the acts that have been enumerated. So long, therefore, as principle is maintained, or precedent respected, its claim to the pecuniary aid of the Government, cannot be resisted on the ground of a want of authority to grant it.

I trust, however, that the Colonization Society, in its application to Congress, will not rely exclusively on its power of appropriation; but will endeavour to draw to the accomplishment of its object all the necessary powers of the Government. I hope and believe it is the intention of the Agents, to whom this interesting subject has been committed, to ask their Government to do for the Colony at Liberia, what the Government of Great Britain has already done for a similar settlement at Sierra Leone: to take it into their possession, to enlarge its limits, to provide for it a suitable government, to guarantee its safety, and to hold out the necessary inducements to the free people of colour to return to the land of their fathers. They owe such an application to the cause in which they are engaged; to the few Colonists that have already embarked in their enterprise; to the thousands who are yet contemplating their efforts with anxious solicitude; but above all, to the deep and lasting interests of their own country. Nor should they be alarmed by constitutional difficulties, existing only in the imaginations of those who have suggested them. Should they ask of Congress all that I have proposed to them,—and should Congress grant them all they ask, "no holy barriers of the Constitution" will be broken down, and no powers will be exercised, but such as have been exercised before, and are already acknowledged to exist. Territory must be acquired, as in the case of Louisiana and Florida, with a view to "the common defence and the general welfare:" "needful rules and regulations," in the language of the Constitution, must be provided for its government, and their efficacy must be insured by suitable appropriations, such as necessarily appertain to every legitimate exercise of power.

Such, then, is the aid to be solicited of the Federal Government. And these are the provisions under which it may be constitutionally bestowed. In acting on the subject, Congress will not be influenced by the idle jealousies and direful forebodings of Caius Gracchus. They will not be alarmed by apprehensions as groundless as a fervid imagination, operated on by habitual suspicion, could possibly

have suggested. They will not be deterred from the accomplishment of an acknowledged good, by the fearful alternative prescribed to them, of either saddling the country with "a permanent Colonial System," or "of extending the rights and privileges of the Federal Union to the shores of Africa, and to a negro population." Neither will be necessary. The territory to be acquired will be acquired for a special purpose, believed to be conducive to the general interests of the nation. No provision need be made, as in the case of Louisiana and Florida, for its future admission into the Union, because no considerations of expediency will require its permanent connection with our Government. Purchased as territory, it will retain its territorial character, subject to "the rules and regulations of Congress," until its accomplishment of the purposes for which it was intended, will justify its erection into a separate and independent government.

I have thus endeavoured very briefly to designate the extent to which "the aid and patronage" of the General Government, will probably be invoked for the objects of the Colonization Society. And if I have succeeded, as I trust I have, in demonstrating the constitutional authority of Congress to accomplish all that will be asked, it only remains to be considered, how far the benefits likely to result to the country, from the removal of its free coloured population, will be equivalent to the risk and the expenditure to be incurred in effecting it. In discussing this important question, I shall again have occasion to pay my respects to the ingenious writer, whose useless interference, and persevering efforts, have forced me unwillingly before the public.

OPIMIUS.

Fairfax County, Oct. 1825.

To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: In advocating an application of the powers and the resources of the General Government, to the gradual removal of the free people of colour from our country, I am aware that some degree of risk and expenditure must, necessarily, be incurred in its accomplishment. But as this would be more or less the case with every measure of general policy that could be proposed, I cannot consider it as an insuperable objection to the one now under consideration. All I ask, is, that on this, as on all other subjects, the

evil and the good may be fairly weighed against each other, and the measure be condemned or approved, as the one or the other shall preponderate.

Against the colonial systems of the nations of Europe, a very decided and well-founded objection has ever prevailed amongst American politicians. The advantages occasionally afforded by the Colonies, to the commerce and navigation of their mother countries, have been more than counterbalanced by the fierce and protracted contests to which they have so often given rise. And the continued restlessness and ultimate struggle for relief that have sometimes resulted from a long continued state of colonial dependence, have rendered it doubtful, whether remote settlements, established for commercial purposes, and regulated on commercial principles, are productive of very great advantages to any nation. An early contemplation of the evils inseparable from them, has, at all events, produced a decided impression amongst ourselves, that the systems out of which they have grown, would be wholly unsuited to the character of our institutions and the habits of our citizens. And it will be a matter of very serious regret, should the pride of foreign conquest, or the spirit of commercial enterprise, ever seduce us from the wholesome principles which have hitherto regulated our conduct on this subject. But it will not be fair to consider the proposed establishment at Liberia as a deviation from these principles. Wholly unconnected with views of national ambition, and designed neither to gratify our pride, to foster our navigation, nor to vary and enlarge the channels of our commerce, it furnishes, in its origin, no food for jealousy to other nations. And should it be continued in the spirit, in which it begins, of steady devotion to the purposes of Christian benevolence and national justice, it cannot fail to draw around it the sympathies of mankind, and to find in the objects of its creation, its surest protection against the enmity of any portion of the civilized world. These very objects, too, by requiring for their accomplishment a course of legislation, adapted rather to the permanent prosperity of the Colony, than to any temporary interests of our own, will guard us against the restlessness and distrust of parental authority, inseparable from the colonial systems of Europe. And the obvious advantage to ourselves of dissolving as soon as possible, the connection that may be created, will furnish us at all times, with certain means of protection against a struggle for independence on the part of the Colony, the only additional danger that has ever been suggested.

Such, then, is a fair estimate of the actual risk to be encountered in the contemplated removal of the free people of colour from the United States to the Western coast of Africa. We have yet to ascertain the probable amount of expenditure, that would also be involved. This, however, must depend so much on contingencies that cannot be calculated, and so much on the extent to which the Government may think proper to interfere, that all estimates on the subject must be as indefinite as the contingencies on which they rest are uncertain. We have, nevertheless, some data for calculating the most material expenses to be incurred; and I avail myself of these, to show, that in relation to mere expense, there is, in reality, nothing to alarm the fears of a Government, possessing the abundant resources that belong to ours. Land in Africa is of so little value, that the acquisition of a territory sufficient for the whole negro population of the United States, would hardly constitute a serious item of expense. The proceeds of a single year's sales of Western lands, or the cost of a single Indian settlement, would procure an African dominion of indefinite extent.—Nor would the expense of providing and maintaining in force, "the needful rules and regulations" for the government of the territory, be of a more serious character. Judging from the operations of the Colonization Society, we may consider an annual appropriation of ten thousand dollars as fully commensurate with the demands created by the civil list and the military establishment of the Colony in its earlier stages. And this appropriation, so far from increasing, would, in the course of a very few years, be entirely supplied by the resources of the Colony itself.

But the great expense to be incurred, would be that of transportation: and although a considerable portion of it might, as heretofore, be left to the contributions of particular communities, to the general benevolence of the nation, and in many instances, to the individual means of the negroes themselves, we will, nevertheless, in forming our estimates, consider the whole of it as falling on the Government of the United States. The expenditures of the Colonization Society under this head, have been continually diminishing, as the attention and experience of its Agents have increased.—In the expedition of last spring, the cost per head, including a supply of provisions for several months, did not exceed twenty dollars; and, if I mistake not, the present intelligent Agent of the Society, anticipates a still further reduction, possibly to ten dollars. But that I may err (if I err at all)

on the right side, I will assume the average cost of the transportation of the Colonists to be twenty-five dollars;* and Caius Gracchus himself, will probably be surprised to learn, that, at this rate, the whole black population of the country might be removed to the shores of Africa for fifty millions of dollars, while that portion of it, already free, would cost something less than six millions of dollars.

I take it for granted, however, that the most zealous advocate for the scheme of colonizing the people of colour, would hardly think it practicable to effect, at once, their entire removal. And even if a miracle should render it practicable, I apprehend that but few would acquiesce in the propriety of attempting so sudden, and so great a revolution in the condition and habits of our country. Whatever is done must be done gradually. Time must be allowed, not only to give security and additional happiness to the blacks to be removed, but also to form the habits, and to accommodate the circumstances of the whites, who will remain, to the new order of things that must necessarily ensue. If it were in contemplation, therefore, to remove the whole coloured population of the country, containing two millions of individuals, every consideration of humanity, as well us policy, would suggest the propriety of effecting it by an operation so gradual, as to require not less than twenty or thirty years at least for its accomplishment. And such would be the annual removal of one hundred thousand, being forty thousand more than their estimated increase, and requiring an annual expenditure of two millions five hundred thousand dollars.

But the present object of the Colonization Society, and that to which the attention of the Government will be first directed, is, the removal of the free people of colour, consisting of something less than two hundred and fifty thousand. Their annual increase at three per cent. would be seven thousand five hundred, the cost of removing which, at twenty-five dollars each, would be one hundred and eighty-seven thousand five hundred dollars. But as the object is not only to prevent their increase, but also to insure their rapid decrease in the country, it is hoped that if the Government be induced to act on the subject at all, such an appropriation will be made, as will ensure the removal in the course of ten years, not only of those who are now free, and

* Since writing the above, I am informed that a commercial company in Baltimore have proposed to the Colonization Society, to transport any number of Colonists to Africa, at twenty dollars each, to be paid by the Colonists themselves, at the end of two years.

their descendants, but of all such also, as the humanity of individuals may, in the course of that time, liberate with a view to their colonization on the coast of Africa. And such, I venture to assert, would be an annual appropriation of one million of dollars, calculated to defray every expense connected with the transportation and government of thirty thousand individuals. Whether such an appropriation would exceed in value, the object to be accomplished, will appear from the considerations which I am now about to offer.

In forming a just estimate of the objects of the Colonization Society, and of their claim "to the aid and patronage" of the General Government, it is impossible to overlook entirely, their influence on the present degraded condition of Africa, or to forget how large a share of the long continued sufferings of that devoted section of the world, might be traced to the cupidity and inhumanity of our own countrymen. I should be sorry to see the energies and resources of our Government withdrawn from objects of importance at home, and wasted on idle attempts at civilizing and improving the condition of foreign nations. But I cannot consider it an objection to any scheme of domestic policy, that its benefits are to be participated in, by others as well as ourselves. And when it is Africa and her wretched inhabitants, on whom these benefits are to fall, I envy not the feelings of that man, who can contemplate with hostility, or even with cold indifference, the effort of his country, to carry civilization and religion to those who have hitherto received at its hand, nothing but stripes and chains, and death. America stands deservedly foremost in the noble struggle to arrest the injuries of Africa. But she will have accomplished little, if she stops here. The recollection of the injuries she has done, is yet fresh in the memory of mankind; and while the moral and political degradation of Africa continues, she will find in it, a perpetual remembrancer to herself of her former deeds of injustice and cruelty. If the plan of the Colonization Society, therefore, presented no other claim to public consideration, the opportunity which it offers for removing from before us, this horrid spectre of early and unatoned-for guilt, ought alone to secure to it, the countenance of the nation, and the patronage of the Government. But, fortunately for the cause of humanity, it addresses itself to feelings more powerful in their operation, because more directly connected with our interests, and more intimately associated with the ordinary pursuits of our lives.

I will not stop to inquire into advantages merely pecuni-

ary in their character. I will not dwell on the spur that must necessarily be given to our navigation by the annual transportation of thirty thousand individuals to the coast of Africa; or on the additional employment to be afforded to our enterprising seamen; or on the commercial advantages to result to us from an independent settlement on the coast of Africa, bound to us not less by habits of early association, than by a grateful recollection of the act of national justice, to which it will have owed its origin. These are considerations that will of course occupy the attention of our statesmen; and if they do not furnish an inducement for the interference of the Government, will nevertheless diminish, and perhaps entirely dissipate the fears of indefinite expenditure, which have hitherto been allowed too powerful an influence. But there are other advantages to result from the colonization of the free people of colour, that will be felt by every class of the community, and will operate alike on our morals, our habits, our laws, our wealth, and our strength. It is these that have already awakened so deep an interest in the public mind, and it is on these that reliance must be principally placed for an early application of the powers and the resources of the National Government to the great objects to be accomplished.

I have endeavoured, in my first number, very briefly to designate the evils that must necessarily result to us from the continued presence of a population differing from us in habits; idle, because deriving from wealth but few of its most valuable privileges; dissolute, because furnished with none of the most powerful incentives to moral rectitude; animated by no patriotic sympathy for a country, in which it feels itself oppressed; and requiring for its special government a system of laws adapted to its moral and political degradation. That I have not been too extravagant in my estimate of these evils, is fully attested by the records of our courts, by the exhibitions of our public jails and penitentiaries, and by the despotic character of our laws "concerning "slaves, free negroes, and mulattoes." Whoever can contemplate these evidences of the unhappy influence of such a population on our society and our public institutions, and not desire its removal, is (to say the least) an unfit subject for reason and argument. "He would not be persuaded though one should come to him from the dead."

But there is another and a more interesting view of this subject, which cannot fail to attract the attention of the public, and to elicit whatever of humane and just and generous

feeling yet exists in the bosoms of our countrymen. The removal of the free people of colour from the country, under the auspices of the General Government, while it cannot fail to ameliorate the present condition of our slaves, will furnish the only practicable means for their ultimate elevation to the rank of freemen. Slavery, in its mildest form, is an evil of the darkest character. Cruel and unnatural in its origin, no plea can be urged in justification of its continuance, but the plea of necessity—not that necessity which arises from our habits, our prejudices, or our wants; but the necessity which requires us to submit to existing evils, rather than substitute, by their removal, others of a more serious and destructive character. It was this which procured the recognition of slavery in the Constitution of our country; it is this which has justified its continuance to the present day; and it is in this only that we can find a palliation for the rigours of our law, which might otherwise be considered as the cruel enactments of a dark and dismal despotism. There have not, I am aware, been found wanting individuals to deny both the existence and the obligations of such a necessity. There are men, actuated, in some instances, by a blind and mistaken enthusiasm, and in others, by a spirit of mischievous intent, loudly calling on us, in the names of justice and humanity, for the immediate and unqualified emancipation of our slaves. To men of this description, it is in vain to point out the inevitable effects of such a course, as well on the objects of their real or pretended solicitude, as on the community in which they exist. It is in vain to assure them, that while the preservation of the latter would require a policy even more rigourous than pertains to slavery itself, the short-lived and nominal freedom of the former must end in their ultimate and utter extinction. All this is of no consequence. Provided slavery be abolished in name, it matters not what horrors may be substituted in its room.

There is another class of our citizens, on the contrary, less numerous, it is true, but not less mistaken in their opinions, and not less intolerant in maintaining them. They look upon slavery as something of divine origin, "stamped with the seal of destiny," and not to be assailed by "the feeble efforts of man." Acknowledging no term to its existence, they even contemplate, with undissembled hostility, every attempt to ameliorate its condition. It was by men of this description, that the abolition of the slave trade was so long and so successfully resisted. It was men

like these, who fought and conquered for a while, but finally fell before the triumphant eloquence of Pitt and Fox, of Wilberforce and Burke. And it is the same class of politicians in our own country, who are now endeavouring to throw every obstacle in the way of whatever may soften the hard necessities of slavery, or open the way to its gradual and voluntary extermination.

With the more rational and intelligent part of the community, it will constitute no cause of objection to the Colonization Society, that in its principles and its plans, it avoids both of the extremes which I have thus endeavoured to explain. Recognising the constitutional and legitimate existence of slavery, it seeks not to interfere, either directly or indirectly, with the rights which it creates. Acknowledging the necessity by which its present continuance and the rigourous provisions for its maintenance are justified, it aims only at furnishing the States, in which it exists, the means of immediately lessening its severities, and of ultimately relieving themselves from its acknowledged evils. It is for these purposes, in part, that it is now about to urge the Government of the Union to commence the gradual removal of the free people of colour to the Western coast of Africa. The existence of that description of population in the vicinity, and in the very midst of our slaves, has ever been a source of complicated evils to us. Distinguished from their unfortunate brethren only by their freedom from domestic restraint, the comparative facility with which they are enabled to indulge their vicious propensities, while it is a source of envy and of restless anxiety to the slave, furnishes him, at the same time, with a temptation to guilt and with the means of concealment. Hence, have arisen some of the severest provisions of our laws—hence, the most cruel restraints to which slavery is subjected—and hence only, the early discouragement, and of late years, the absolute prohibition of emancipation in many of the Southern States. Let the cause of these evils be removed, let the source of these rigours be dried up, and the evils and the rigours will disappear together. The very first step that shall be taken by the Government of the United States, for the removal of the free people of colour to the coast of Africa, will be a signal for the general amelioration of the condition of slavery, and in the end, will leave humanity but little to deplore in relation to it, but the continuance of its name and its forms.

Nor am I without a hope, that even these will ultimately be abandoned. There is no riveted attachment to slavery

prevailing extensively in any portion of our country. Its injurious effects on our habits, our morals, our individual wealth, and more especially on our national strength and prosperity, are universally felt, and almost universally acknowledged. Its evils are submitted to, from the stern necessity which imposes them upon us. We have made no effort to relieve ourselves from their operation, from the fear of encountering others still greater than those we should escape. We have felt the utter impossibility of uniting in the same community and of admitting to an equality of privileges two classes of freemen, not more unlike in colour than in the characters of their minds and the propensities of their natures. From this dilemma, the plan of the Colonization Society affords us the only effectual relief. The asylum (under the auspices of the General Government, the safe asylum) which would be provided in Africa for liberated slaves, would furnish abundant scope for action, to individual humanity and the legislative wisdom of the States. Of the certain operations of the former, we have the means of judging in what it has already done. The favourable reception of the propositions of the Colonization Society in every part of the Southern country, evince a general and heartfelt interest in its success. And the many sacrifices of individual wealth which have already been made to a generous and enlightened philanthropy, are unerring prognostics of the more extensive operation of the same benevolent feeling, when its happy results in relation to those by whom it is excited, shall be rendered certain by the protection and support of the Government of the country. The interference of the authorities of the States will be more slow, perhaps, but not less certain in the end. The feelings of the people must ultimately reach their legislative bodies—and these will find, in the contemplated African establishment, the removal of the greatest, if not the only serious obstacle to the gradual emancipation of the slaves within the limits of their respective States. No longer perplexed with the difficulty of providing for them when liberated, they will more readily engage in the less arduous but not less important duty of determining how and when their liberation shall be effected.

Such, then, are the objects of the Colonization Society, and such the grounds on which its claims to the favourable consideration of the nation, and to the aid and patronage of the General Government, may very fairly be urged. It remains with an enlightened public to decide, whether objects such as these shall be defeated by arguments calculated to

strip the Government of its most necessary powers, and to perpetuate to the nation the acknowledged evils of domestic slavery. For my own part, I fear not the result. "*Magna est veritas, et prevalebit.*" OPIMIUS.

Fairfax County, October 25, 1825.

To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: I am aware that very great excitement exists in many parts of the Southern country, on the subject of the Colonization Society. Nor am I at all surprised at it, when I behold such writers as Caius Gracchus, devoting their time and talents to the propagation of the most erroneous views, in relation to the objects and operations of the Society. It is very natural that those who look to the public prints, as their only source of general information, should be alarmed and indignant, when told in the most polished language, and in a tone of apparent sincerity, that there exists in the very midst of them, a body of men, denying the validity of long established rights, secretly undermining the value of their property, acting in connection with the Abolition Societies of the North, stimulating the Governments of the non-slave-holding States to a direct and impertinent interference with their negroes, and giving birth to many of the most hateful questions that have ever agitated the councils of the country. When these and a thousand other things of similar import, are publicly proclaimed through the medium of an influential press, we ought not to be surprised, if the community should be stirred into actual commotion, and even be induced to boast, in the indiscreet language of their prompter, that they "have intelligence to understand their rights, and chivalry enough to defend them."

But what must be the feelings of that community, when they shall learn, that the greater part of these high and mighty charges have originated in the simple fact, that a few intelligent and respectable individuals, most of them slave-holders, have associated together, to devise means for withdrawing from their country, an idle and profligate, and mischievous population,—and that their connection with the Missouri Question, with Abolition Societies, and with certain imaginary machinations of the State and General Governments, has been most ingeniously deduced from the hope, which some of them have indulged, and some perhaps have ventured to express, that their efforts in relation to the free

coloured people of the country, might possibly lead to the gradual emancipation and removal of a yet more degraded portion of our population? Is there any thing in such an Association, or in the indulgence, or even expression of such a hope, to justify the furious invective that has been pronounced against them? Or is there, in reality, any thing in them, to alarm our fears, to endanger our Union, or to bring down upon us those severe domestic afflictions, which a vivid and phrenzied imagination has so unblushingly predicted?

Caius Gracchus may save himself the unpleasant alternative of either questioning the sincerity of the original founders of the Society, or of lamenting the subsequent interpolation of a principle disavowed at its earlier meetings. A further examination of the documents from which he has thought proper to make some garbled extracts, would have shown him that the very individuals on whose authority he relies for the principles in which he supposes the Society to have originated, gave their deliberate sanction to that principle, which he now denounces as a subsequent and alarming interpolation. Mr. Randolph, for instance, who had been most strenuous in disavowing any intention of interfering with the property in slaves, nevertheless urged in favour of the Colony proposed to be established in Africa, the inducement it would hold out for the emancipation of slaves. "If," says he, "a place can be provided for their reception, and a mode of sending them hence, there are hundreds, nay thousands of citizens, who would, by manumitting their slaves, relieve themselves from the cares attendant on their possession." Judge Washington, too, when speaking in his first address, of the contemplated African settlement, says, "Should it lead, as we may fairly hope it will, to the slow but gradual abolition of slavery, it will wipe from our political institutions the only blot which stains them, and in palliation of which, we shall not be at liberty to plead the excuse of moral necessity, until we shall have honestly exerted all the means which we possess for its extinction." And even Mr. Clay, who had declared his connection with the Society to be the result of a conviction "that it was not intended to affect, in any manner, the tenure by which a certain species of property was held," nevertheless advocated the establishment of a Colony, as a means of enabling "the Legislatures of the States, who had been grieved at the necessity of passing laws prohibiting emancipation, to remove the impediments to the exercise of benevolence and humanity." And he further called for the reading of a letter from Mr. Jeffer-

son, expressing his earnest wish, "that the United States would themselves undertake to form an establishment on the coast of Africa;" and dwelling on its happy effect in drawing off "the coloured population of the country."

From these evidences, then, it would seem, that while the founders of the Society disclaimed and anxiously avoided all interference with the question of slavery, calculated to affect the rights and obligations it created, they looked to the influence to be exerted, on the present condition and ultimate destination of the slave population, as one of the strongest arguments in favour of the measure that was proposed. And such, I unhesitatingly affirm, is the principle that has governed all the operations of the Society, from its commencement down to the present day. Its connection with the Abolition Societies of the country, gratuitously assumed, is disproved, not only by the fact that it has uniformly found in those Societies its bitterest and most persevering enemies, but that it differs from them on the very principle of their existence; for while they refuse all terms of compromise with slavery, and deny the legitimacy either of its origin or its continuance, the Colonization Society recognizes, in their fullest extent, the rights it begets, and aims at their extinguishment, only by holding out inducements to their voluntary abandonment. With the Missouri Question, too, the Society had nothing to do as a body. The principles involved in that celebrated question, were wholly unconnected with its objects. And so far as its feelings in relation to those principles, are to be inferred from attendant circumstances, the opposition of many of its most active members to the proposed restrictions on Missouri, would authorize a conclusion directly the reverse of that at which Caius Gracchus has arrived.

On the subject of Mr. King's resolution in the Senate of the United States, and of certain other resolutions, adopted by some of the non-slave-holding States, a most extraordinary degree of excitement prevails amongst a portion of our Southern politicians. If the spirit and design of those resolutions were to be inferred only from the angry commentaries to which they have given rise, we should imagine nothing less than a most unholy combination for the purpose of destroying our property, and involving our whole Southern country in the horrors of a servile war. And if the ingenious speculations of Caius Gracchus are to be taken for facts, this combination would be rendered still more extraordinary and still more infamous by having originated with

a Society composed, for the most part, of Southern gentlemen—the owners of the very property whose destruction is intended. Without stopping to inquire into the course of reasoning by which this unnatural connection has been deduced, I will proceed, at once, to the less difficult and more agreeable task of investigating the real character of the proceedings that have given rise to so much and such unnecessary excitement. The following are the only resolutions known to have been adopted by any of the non-slave-holding States, viz:

By New Jersey.

"*Resolved,* That in the opinion of this Legislature, a system of foreign colonization, with correspondent measures, might be adopted, that would in due time effect the entire emancipation of slaves in our country. and furnish an asylum for the free blacks, *without any violation of the national compact, or infringement of the rights of individuals;* and that such a system should be predicated upon the principle, that the evil of slavery is a national one, *and that the people and the States of this Union, ought mutually to participate in the duties and the burdens of removing it.*"

By Ohio.

A resolution recommending "the gradual but entire emancipation of slaves, and a system of foreign colonization; and the passage of a law by the General Government, *with the consent of the slave-holding States,* providing that all children born of slaves thereafter, be free at the age of 21; and recognising the evil of slavery as a national one, and the principle that all the States should share in the duties and burdens of removing it."

By Connecticut.

"*Resolved,* That the existence of slavery in the United States, is a great national evil, and that the people and the States ought to participate in the burdens and the duties of removing it, by all just and prudent measures, which may be adopted *with a due regard to their internal peace and mutual harmony;* and that a system of colonization under the patronage of the General Government may reasonably be deemed conducive to so desirable an object."

And the following resolution was submitted to the Senate of the United States, by Mr. King, of New York.

"*Resolved,* That as soon as the portion of the existing funded debt of the United States, for the payment of which the public land of the United States is pledged, shall have been paid off; then, and thenceforth, the whole of the public land of the United States, with the nett proceeds of all future sales thereof, shall constitute or form a fund, which is hereby appropriated, and the faith of the United States is pledged, that the said fund shall be inviolably applied, to aid the emancipation of such slaves, within any of the United States, and aid the removal of such slaves, and the removal of such free people of colour in any of the said States, *as by the laws of the States* respectively, may be allowed to be emancipated, or removed to any territory or country, without the limits of the U. S. of America."

Such are the proceedings adduced to show that a deliberate and powerful combination has been formed against the rights and tranquillity of the Southern States. The newspaper paragraphists have presented them in shapes, calculated to appal the stoutest hearts. They have furnished

Governor Troup with some of his choisest displays of gubernatorial eloquence. And Caius Gracchus, with more of passion than discretion, has even ventured to threaten the Government of his country with the "chivalry of the South." To knights thus armed and thus infuriated, I will only say, in the language of Othello, "keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them." The people of the South have too much "intelligence," to mistake a spirit of magnanimity for hostile design, and too much real "chivalry" to enlist themselves under the banners of our "wasp-stung and impatient" Hotspurs.

Whoever will look to the proceedings that have been quoted as they really are, and not through the medium of a blind and bigoted prejudice, will perceive that they not only originated in a spirit of generous magnanimity, but that they are marked by the most delicate and scrupulous regard to the rights and privileges, and feelings of the South. The resolutions of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Ohio, are nothing more than declarations of a willingness on the part of States, themselves exempt from the evils of slavery, "*to participate in the duties and burdens of removing it*" from us. They neither demand its removal as a right, nor enjoin it as an obligation. They leave every thing to the disposition and discretion of those, who are most deeply interested; and expressly desire that every measure, in which they are to participate, may be adopted, only "*with the consent of the slave-holding States,*" "*without any violation of the national compact,*" and "*with a due regard to the internal peace, and mutual harmony*" of the whole country. In the same spirit of liberal feeling, and with the same delicate regard to the peculiar situation of the South, a distinguished Senator of New York, proposes the establishment of a fund, not by the slave-holding States only, but by all the States in the Union, "to aid in the emancipation and removal of such slaves, *as by the laws of the States respectively*, may be allowed to be emancipated or removed, to any territory or country, without the limits of the United States of America." And how have we met this generous spirit? How have we received these kind and friendly offers? By denouncing them (if Caius Gracchus can be supposed to speak our sentiments,) as "an indelicate and pragmatical interference" in our concerns, and as an insidious attempt to destroy our property, to endanger our peace, and to subvert the Constitution of our country. But such are not the feelings, and such is not the language of the South. We duly appreciate the generous

offer of others "to participate in the burden" of removing an evil from ourselves. And we are deeply impressed with that refinement of delicacy, and that scrupulous regard to the spirit, as well as letter of the Constitution, which proposes to leave us undisturbed in designating the time and mode, in which their participation shall be allowed. The day, perhaps, is not far distant, when we shall be in a situation to avail ourselves of the proffered aid of our Northern brethren, and when fully awake to the evils of our condition, we shall look to the Colony at Liberia, and the fund proposed to be created, as the surest means of relieving us from the greatest curse, with which, Heaven, in its wisdom, has seen proper to afflict us. It is for a supposed attempt on the part of the Colonization Society, to hasten the arrival of that auspicious day, by the exercise of what has been denominated "a moral influence," that it is indebted for some of the keenest invectives, and some of the sagest advice of its polished and erudite antagonist.

If to have looked to the removal of the coloured population of our country, as "a consummation devoutly to be wished"—if to have laboured with the most untiring zeal to demonstrate, by experiment, the possibility of effecting it—and if in fine, to have sought by the most quiet and unobtrusive means, to awaken in the public mind, an interest in behalf of its generous enterprise, be evidences of the exercise of "a moral influence," the Society must plead guilty to the charge, and rest for its justification on the prudence with which its operations have been conducted, and on the intimate connection of its object with the best interests of the country, with the noblest feelings of the human heart, and with the purest principles of Christian benevolence.

The Colonization Society has, at all times, been aware of the delicate nature of the subject in which it was engaged, and its progress has accordingly been marked by a degree of caution, unparalleled in the history of similar associations. It has preferred to subject itself to the charge, and, indeed to the actual inconveniences of over-cautious delay, rather than by a single movement of even questionable character, to alarm the fears of the timid, or excite the anger of the prejudiced. Its publications (the least guarded of which is less dangerous in its character than the essays of Caius Gracchus,) have been addressed, as well from their style, as from the channels through which they have been communicated, only to the more intelligent portions of the community. Its meetings have been confined exclusively to the whites. And

even its Agents, who are said to be "penetrating society in all directions," have (if I am correctly informed,) chosen to weaken the force of their representations, and to diminish the extent of their influence, rather than call to their aid the powerful enthusiasm which their subject, in all its bearings, was so well calculated to inspire. But the little, the very little danger to be apprehended from "the moral principle" which the Society is charged with attempting to inculcate, cannot be better attested, than by the simple fact, that during the eight years of its existence, the country, "which a single spark," it is said, "would be sufficient to throw into a flame," has remained undisturbed even in its most delicate relations.

And what, let me ask, is the object to be effected by the operation of this "moral principle"? The removal of a population cruelly forced on the present generation by those who have preceded it—a population equally injurious to our morals, our wealth, our political purity, and our physical strength—a population which Caius Gracchus has, not more eloquently than justly, described as "degraded and debased from the very knowledge of their condition as slaves, dissolute and abandoned in their moral character, and with passions and feelings of the most lawless and brutal kind."

And is it possible that any rational man—is it possible that any member of a Christian community, any citizen of a republican country, can seriously object to the operation of an influence whose object is the removal of such a population? If a feeling of justice does not prompt us to restore to others, when we can, what has been forcibly wrested from them—if a sentiment of philanthropy inspires us with no wish to civilize and enlighten a benighted portion of the world—if we do not feel under obligation to carry to Africa, whom we have injured, the healing balm of the religion in which we believe,—yet let us not be deaf to the calls of patriotism: let us not look, with cold indifference, on our country, gifted by nature with every advantage of soil and climate, and location, hourly diminishing in its wealth, losing its comparative weight in the nation, of which it is a part, subjected to a system of legislation, foreign to the principles it professes, and destined, perhaps, to rely in the end, for its own security on the strength of others, and not on its own resources.

Is there any inhabitant of the South, who will pronounce this picture to be overdrawn? Or is there any citizen of Virginia, who will attribute the evils it presents, to any cause than the character of our labouring population? Let him look to our languishing agriculture, our deserted farms, our

decayed fortunes, our decreasing population; let him cast up, in his own ledger, his profit and loss account for the last fifteen or twenty years, and then let him say whether the labour of the slave is not a curse to the land on which it is expended? But I forbear; the theme is as fruitful and as inspiring as it is delicate. The sentiments I have uttered, are the sentiments of a slave-holder; of one, too, whose interests are peculiarly those of the country in which he lives. He has examined this subject in all its bearings, and he unhesitatingly pronounces an early and a combined operation of the States and the General Government, essential to save the country from progressive debility and premature decay.

OPIMIUS.

Fairfax County, Nov. 6, 1825.

To the Editors of the Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: A friend of Caius Gracchus would beg leave to make his acknowledgments to the "Member of the American Colonization Society," whose flickering light has lately beamed upon the public through the medium of your paper; and to inform him, that when he becomes less *equivocal*, in the expression of his own and his Society's views upon our slave population, than is disclosed by his late communication, Gracchus may deem it no misapplication of his time to bestow on him some notice. At present, it seems to be a *puzzle* with the best *wits* of the land to discover whether he is really an advocate, or not, of the abolition principle, which his Society is now engaged in asserting.

If I have not mistaken the general scope of the remarks of Gracchus, it is a matter of perfect indifference in his view of the subject, whether the principle of abolition is to be considered as a *fungus*, which has fastened itself upon the Society; formed and concreted of the elements of disaffection, since its first foundation; or whether, it be a covert principle, which has at all times lurked in its bosom, and been cherished "under the rose." In either event, its mischievous effects ought equally to be exposed and deprecated. But lest this "Member of the American Colonization Society" should cherish the belief, that the silence of Gracchus and his friends resulted from their being convinced by him; I will venture to suggest for his *better* consideration a few passing remarks, which may possibly lead him to a more correct view, of what he alleges to be the "main ground of accusa-

tion—the inconsistency of the Society in departing from their original design:" But which Gracchus himself, and every attentive reader must consider a very subordinate point in the discussion. Let us, however, indulge the worthy "Member," for a moment, in his own choice of objections. Gracchus, after taking an enlarged view in his communications to the Auxiliary Society of Powhatan, for the purpose of showing the impolicy and danger of the scheme; in his closing address to Judge Washington, stated, that "he believed he should have but little difficulty in proving to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced minds, that the original objects of the Association had been changed, and that views and objects were now in contemplation, which formed no part of their original purpose." The expression of this opinion imposed upon him a duty of a two-fold character: 1st, to prove, by a reference to the most authentic documents of the Society, and the public declarations of its founders *at the time*, what were its *original* objects; and 2dly, to show by the declarations and acts of the Society, and the opinions and practices of their acknowledged Agents throughout the country, what are *its views and objects now.* This he has no doubt done to the satisfaction of all but the worthy "Member" and his associates. But as *he* is still sceptical, let him examine the Constitution of the Society, which of all other documents ought to contain the declaration of so important a principle, if it had been designed to adopt it.* Yet in this instrument not an intimation even, is to be found of such a sentiment! No, not even *eventual or consequential abolition!* Let him advert, too, to the style of the Association, which in Societies are generally declarative of their objects. Here, too, will be found nothing but the simple title of "The American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour of the United States."—But to place this matter beyond all possibility of a doubt, can it be seriously contended that such men as Messrs. Randolph and Clay were practising a fraud upon society, when they declare, at the very moment of founding the Institution, *that it was not their object to touch or agitate any question con-*

*See the 2d Article of the Constitution, in the following words:—"ART. 2d. The object to which its attention is to be *exclusively directed*, is to promote and execute a plan of colonization (with their consent) of the free people of colour residing in our country, in Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient. And the Society shall aid, to effect this object, in co-operation with the General Government, and such of the States as may adopt regulations upon this subject."

nected with the abolition of slavery; and that it was upon that condition only, that the gentlemen from the South and West had attended, or could be expected to co-operate? Or, does the worthy "Member" distrust the sincerity of Mr. Key when he proposed his solemn disclaimer upon this subject? I hope for the credit of his Institution he does not.

But he is still incredulous, if I have understood him correctly, (for upon this subject he is quite mysterious,) whether the Society, in its corporate character, or its subordinate Agents, are conducting their scheme with an eye to the eventual abolition of slavery in the United States.

Without undertaking a dull criticism to show what this extract or the other extract exactly proves, as quoted in Appendix G; let me emphatically ask, for what *object* was that chapter made up and given to the world as the solemn act of the Society: being appended to the third Annual Report, and bound up and circulated with it by order of the Managers? Let the answer be given by the Society itself. It was because it had been affirmed, "that in the Constitution and proceedings of the Society, or in the avowed sentiments of its members, there could be discovered nothing friendly to the abolition of slavery in the United States." Here then is a distinct corporate act, undertaken and performed for the express purpose of disproving this charge, and declaring to the whole world that the Society was operating with an eye among other things to the *eventual abolition of slavery.* But the proofs upon this subject do not end here; they might be made to thicken around the worthy "Member," until even incredulity itself would cease to doubt; were I not restrained by the proper limits of a publication of this sort, as well as a due respect for the public understanding. A few more then, only, of a very striking character, shall be offered. Let us hear General Harper, one of the Vice-Presidents, in his speech before the Society, the 20th of February, 1824, in support of his proposition to memorialize Congress, and which will be found prefixed to the sixth Annual Report:—"A few hundred," says the General, "at the utmost a thousand Colonists, might be within the reach of our efforts; by such an experiment we shall demonstrate this, and essentially benefit the individuals: but further by our exertions we cannot hope to go. In the mean while there exists among us a great social evil (alluding to our slave population) a cancer on the body politic, that is gradually eating its way to the vitals of the State. It is at work while we sleep, and when we wake, and it will continue if not speedily arrested to per-

vade and corrode, till at length it has destroyed the entire mass of our social strength and happiness. It can't be touched by us. It needs a far mightier hand. The removal of a few thousand individuals will, in an evil of such magnitude, produce but little effect; for it consists of more than a million and a half of persons, and though three or four hundred thousand already free should be removed, the great political mischief among us would be but slightly affected. How then is this *more extensive operation, which alone can complete the scope of our design,* to be ultimately or ever accomplished?"

After stating his views of the mode to be pursued, and endeavouring to show that it was a legitimate subject for the interposition of Congress, he further says: "To the National Government, then, let us address ourselves. The object on which we address them is national in its magnitude, both for good and evil, chiefly for evil." To this speech, Mr. Mercer, another Vice-President, rose in reply and said, "He had listened with great pleasure to the remarks of his eloquent friend, and he did not now rise for the purpose of opposing the adoption of the resolution." But proceeded to urge some objection to the time of making the application, on the ground of its being premature, and among other things said, "I apprehend that we overrate the amount of our moral influence in society, when we indulge the supposition that our system is at present ripe for the measure proposed." Another gentleman, Mr. G. W. P. Custis, also took part in the same debate, in support of the motion, and among other things said, "He would go to the great Council of the Nation, as the guardian of American Liberty, and the conservators of the public morals. He would tell them, you are the last of Republics; you boast that this is the seat of freedom, of justice, of honour, of high and magnanimous feeling. The evil we would remedy is none of ours. It was done before we were born, and it is left for us to undo. Lend us your aid *to strike the fetters from the slave, and to spread the enjoyment of unfettered freedom over the whole of our favoured and happy land.*" Can we mistake this language? Is not the measure of proof on this subject full to overflowing? But the Society has gone farther, and has actually established a monthly Journal, termed the "African Repository," which issued its first number in March last, for the purpose of promoting the views and objects of the Institution: In which it is openly avowed in every page where the objects of the Society are spoken off, that colonization is

their present and *immediate object*, but that the general abolition of slavery throughout the United States, is their *ulterior object* by creating facilities, and the inculcation of a great moral principle, favourable to emancipation.

I would now fain ask the worthy "Member," if a stranger to the operations of the Society since its first formation were called on to decide upon its principles and objects from the face of its Constitution and the public declarations of its founders at the time, whether he would have dared to ascribe to it any such object, as is now openly avowed? It is no sufficient answer to this view of the subject to say, that at an early period after its formation, such principles and objects were avowed by some of its members. This I know to be the fact, and it was no doubt the knowledge of that fact that led Gracchus to the belief, that immediately upon its organization it had afforded a rallying point for all the disaffected upon the subject of slavery, who had infused into its operations, a principle neither contemplated by its founders, nor warranted by its Constitution.

Here then let us take leave of this branch of the subject forever, as it is a matter of secondary importance, at most, from what period we are to date the first existence of this abolition principle. The question emphatically is, does it now exist? And is it one of the *ulterior objects* of the Society? Let the worthy "Member" who defends his Institution with such true faith, be a little more frank upon this subject. Let him not tell us, when the Society is pressed by the slave owner or Gracchus, "with the prosecution of dangerous objects, and that they meant to alarm the public with schemes of abolition:" "That they prosecuted no such scheme, that they were only to labour for the removal of the free, and that those who were unwilling to emancipate, would be benefited by their success"; and on the other hand, turning round to the abolitionist, who might be complaining "that their design was selfish, and only calculated to make servitude more secure and rigourous," say, "that their *object*, if attained, would benefit those who were willing, but unable to emancipate." This indeed he must pardon me for regarding as the merest equivocue.—The public inquiries and apprehensions cannot thus be satisfied. Already has one of the Vice-Presidents, in the extract of his speech above quoted, declared that the total eradication of slavery "would alone complete the scope of their design."

But the worthy "Member" has charged Gracchus with "passing judgment in a cause which he had not heard;"

and has been kind enough to say "if he had applied for information, &c. he would have had his fears relieved." Gracchus must feel himself obliged by this hint, but as the only information known to the public, consisted of the printed Annual Reports of the Society, and the documents appended thereto, with such further information as the public Gazettes and their "Colonial Journal" could furnish, he no doubt freely consulted these, and did not allow himself for a moment to believe, that there was any thing in *reserve* which was either too dangerous, or too delicate for the public ear.

It is also alleged that the *printed* communications of Gracchus, designed only to excite a proper degree of reflection upon the principles and objects of the Colonization So iety, are more likely to produce the mischief he deprecates, than the delusive promises and inflated pictures of liberty, which are known to be addressed directly to our slave population, both from the *pulpit* and the press, by the friends of colonization. Perhaps by the same process of reasoning, the worthy "Member" would consider resistance to the assassin who might lurk upon the high way to rob me both of my purse and my life, as improper; because such resistance might lead to a breach of the peace. So, too, if our country was invaded by a foreign foe, who sought to overturn our Government and lay waste our dwellings, we ought not to resist; because this too might lead to bloodshed. If this be the "close" logic which the worthy "Member" holds up in terrorem to Gracchus, then indeed he has much reason to fear.

But he is kind enough to invite Gracchus to come among them "inter nos." This invitation I presume he will decline for many very good reasons. One among others, because it is believed Gracchus would make neither a good schemer nor an abolitionist.

We are told, also, that the Missouri Question came upon us from the North. This is most certainly true; and it is the *countenance* given by the doctrines of the Society to such visits, of which we complain. Let the worthy "Member" recollect that the seducer is seldom bold; that he carefully watches the hapless moment when he is to extend his embrace, and is often invited by the indiscretion of his victim.

But we have the kind and gracious promise that this question, and all others of a kindred character, shall never more be discussed in Congress with the consent of the Society. If this assurance did not stand opposed by the numerous memorials which the Society have already presented to Congress, and by the fact, that it is their intention to renew their en-

treaties at the ensuing session, the slave-holders of the South might be more confiding. But as at present advised, they can only acknowledge the kindness of such a promise, while they would rather choose to rely upon their own efforts for security.

And in conclusion, I must say to the worthy "Member", in equal "candour" with his admonition to Gracchus, that while I consider all attempts to legislate upon the subject by the Federal Government as the grossest usurpation; yet, the mischief to be apprehended from that quarter bears no sort of proportion to the horrible catalogue of ills which are destined to flow from the machinations and schemes of fanatical clubs, scattered over the face of the country in the form of Auxiliary Societies, spreading discontent and insubordination where contentment, happiness, and industry ought to obtain: That efforts like these ought indeed to be "forborne."

PHILO-GRACCHUS.

Note.—It is perhaps proper here to acknowledge that Philo-Gracchus is from the same pen with Caius Gracchus, and was given to the public under a different signature because *Gracchus* was at that time assailed from several different quarters; and it was thought adviseable to preserve the principal signature from being involved in too many controversies at the same time.

To the Editors of the Enquirer.

Gentlemen: If the history of the world did not afford so many examples of misguided enthusiasm, upon the subjects of religion and liberty, as well as of extraordinary zeal, in defence of their wildest excesses and usurpations, I should probably have felt some surprise, at the unusual excitement produced among the friends of colonization, by the late numbers of Caius Gracchus: communications which were only designed to excite a proper degree of reflection upon the principles and objects of the Society, and to recall my countrymen, if possible, from the prosecution of a wild and dangerous scheme, in behalf of which, the united powers of both *Church* and *State*, were sought to be enlisted. But no sooner are those essays given to the public, than I am made to feel all the consequences of my temerity, by attacks from different portions of the State. A worthy "Member of the American Colonization Society," first sheds upon me his dubious light; and while he is good enough to say, that he

"is disposed to think me fair and candid," is not himself sufficiently so, to avow distinctly, that the *ultimate* abolition of slavery in the U. S. is a part of their scheme, and that it is the intention of the Society to throw itself upon the aid and patronage of the Federal Government. While Opimius, whose residence is in the evirons of the palace, and of course within the influence of "*courtly manners and sentiments*," visits upon me all the dread and terror which such a name, coupled with the recollection of the fact, that it was Opimius who procured the murder of Gracchus, and was himself the first of the Roman Consuls who *usurped* the dictatorship, is calculated to inspire. But it is not to impressions of this sort, that I can allow myself to yield. It is to the sober reflecting part of the community, to which I have heretofore addressed myself. And I yet believe, there is a redeeming portion of good sense in the country, sufficient to restrain every excess of enthusiasm upon this subject, and to check the usurpations by which the Federal Government would be made tributary to its objects. Permit me then to leave the "Member of the American Col. Society," to his own reflections, and the visitation which he has recently received from "Philo-Gracchus;" and to pay my respects to "Opimius" only, who seems so modestly to have courted the honour of a *tilt* in this crusade. In the discharge of this duty, my first office is to acknowledge the candour which prompts him openly to confess the truth of my *first* and *second* propositions, viz: That private charity is inadequate in itself to accomplish the objects of the Association; and 2dly, that it is the avowed purpose of the Society, to rely upon Congress for protection and support.

This, I presume, I may be at liberty to consider as a clear abandonment of all other grounds of reliance, and a retreat to the last barrier for protection. But this is not all; he has had the candour, still further to declare, that the provision of the Federal Constitution, under which Congress will be called on to act upon this subject, is the general authority of that body "to provide for the common defence and general welfare," as declared in that instrument. This is, indeed, what I had reason to anticipate; but I did not expect to hear it so unequivocally avowed. It is the result to which I knew the Society would be ultimately driven; but in the language of Mr. Mercer, did not imagine that "their system was yet ripe for such a measure." I had myself supposed, that the recent success attending collections for the Society on the 4th of July last, growing out of that ex-

citement of feeling, which the day itself was calculated to produce upon such subjects, and which is known to have been greatly increased in the community, by the visit which the illustrious La Fayette was then paying us, would have produced a further reliance upon this fund; and that Opimius and his friends would have persevered in their efforts upon the charity of the country, until the frequency of their calls had convinced them, that there was a time, after which, the most enthusiastic spirits will become, either unwilling or unable to give. But it seems that this hope has been yielded up in despair, and that the Federal Government is to be called on, "to do for the Colony at Liberia, what the Government of Great Britain has already done for a similar establishment at Sierra Leone: to take it into their possession, to enlarge its limits, to provide for it a suitable government, guarantee its safety, and to hold out the necessary inducements to the free people of colour, to return to the land of their fathers." And this, too, under the power of Congress to provide for the "common defence and general welfare," as declared by the Constitution. And here, permit me to express my surprise, that a writer so obviously intelligent as Opimius, should have staked the last hopes of his Society upon a ground so utterly desperate and untenable: and while we are left at no difficulty in discovering "the political school to which *he* belongs," he affords another example to the many already before the public, that in all political parties, there will be certain individuals who are *ultra* in their opinions, and who greatly outstrip the masters themselves, by whom they have been taught. Few there are, I presume, who have bestowed any attention upon the principles of the two great political parties that divided this country, who do not perfectly understand, that this doctrine of the "general welfare" never was considered as a *settled* article of the ancient federal creed. That it may have been sometimes assumed as a ground of argument in debate, or upon other occasions when the acknowledged powers of the Government did not afford a sufficient warrant for the projects of ambition, will not be controverted. But that it has been conceded "by a large proportion of the wisest and best men of our country, and been sustained by the uniform practice of every administration from the first to the last," is most confidently denied. The extravagancy of this declaration might have created some surprise, if we had not at the same time been furnished with the examples relied on to prove its correctness. In the selection of these, Opimius has been sadly unfortunate.

Not one, out of his whole catalogue, with the exception of the act for the relief of the "distressed inhabitants of Caraccas," but is known to have been placed by their several advocates upon some of the enumerated powers of the Government, or those "necessary and proper" to their execution; as I hope very satisfactorily to show before I take leave of this subject. Let us in the first place, see what some of the "wisest and best men of our country" have said and thought upon this subject of "the common defence and general welfare." And for this purpose, I beg leave to call your attention to an authority upon this subject, which in the construction of the Federal Constitution, has always been looked to by the American politician as a work of the first merit. I mean the numbers of the "Federalist," written by Messrs. Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. In the 41st No. of that work, will be found the following exposition of those terms: "It has been urged, and echoed, that the power '*to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the U. States,*' amounts to an unlimited commission to exercise every power, which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defence and general welfare. No stronger proof could be given, of the distress, under which these writers labour for objections, than their stooping to such misconstructions.

"Had no other enumeration, or definition of the powers of Congress been found in the Constitution, than the general expressions just cited, the authors of the objection might have had some colour for it; though it would have been difficult to find a reason for so awkward a form of describing an authority to legislate in all possible cases. A power to destroy the freedom of the press, the trial by jury, or even to regulate the course of descents, or the forms of conveyances must be very singularly expressed by the terms, *to raise money for the general welfare.*

"But what colour can the objection have, when a specification of the objects alluded to by these general terms, immediately follows, and is not even separated by a longer pause than a semicolon? If the different parts of the same instrument ought to be so expounded, as to give meaning to every part which will bear it; shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any signification whatever? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these, and all

others, were meant to be included in the preceding general power." Such is the language of the Federalist. And although this particular number was written by Mr. Madison, it must unquestionably have met the approbation at that time, of Messrs. Hamilton and Jay, with whom he was associated in the work.

It is true, at a subsequent period, Mr. Hamilton, who had been made Secretary of the Treasury under the new Government, and after party feelings had began to assume their most embittered form, did assert a different doctrine in his Report of 1791, upon the subject of manufactures. But even then, limited it to such objects, as required the appropriation of money. But this doctrine, and the report containing it, never received the sanction of Congress, by any law carrying it into effect: on the contrary, was permitted to die a natural death upon the files, where it was placed. And it is not now remembered, that Mr Hamilton ever afterwards by any official act, sought to establish this doctrine.

There is, however, a still further authority upon this subject, which I must ask permission to present to the public; although I am sensible it will not be very acceptable to Opimius, or any of the disciples of the school to which he belongs. And if it should bring with it, any unkind reminiscences in relation to the overthrow of the "Reign of Terror;" he ought to recollect, that similar usurpations at this day, would most probably end in a like catastrophe. The authority to which I allude, is the Report made to the Virginia Legislature, by a Committee of that body in 1799, upon the subject of the then Federal usurpations; and known also to be the work of Mr. Madison. In this celebrated state paper, which has been justly considered the richest offering which genius and patriotism, ever gave to an admiring country, Opimius may learn if he chooses, the true construction of the Constitution of his country: and from it, I must be indulged in making the following extracts:—"Whether the phrases in question, (meaning the words "to provide for the common defence, and general welfare") be construed to authorize every measure relating to the common defence, and general welfare, as contended by some; or every measure only in which there might be an application of money, as suggested by the caution of others, the effect must substantially be the same, in destroying the import and force of the phrases in the Constitution. For it is evident that there is not a single power whatever, which may not have some reference to the common defence, and general welfare;

nor a power of any magnitude, which in its exercise, does not invoke or admit an application of money. The government therefore which possesses power in either one, or other, of these extents, is a government without the limitations formed by a particular enumeration of powers; and consequently the meaning and effect of this particular enumeration, is destroyed by the exposition given to these general phrases." "The true and fair construction of this expression, both in the original, and existing federal compacts appears to the Committee, too obvious to be mistaken. In both, the Congress is authorized to provide money for the common defence, and general welfare. In both, is subjoined to this authority an enumeration of the cases, to which their power shall extend. Money cannot be applied to the general welfare, otherwise than by an application of it to *some particular measure*, conducive to the general welfare. Whenever therefore money has been applied to a particular measure, a question arises, whether the particular measure, be within the *enumerated* authorities vested in Congress. If it be, the money requisite for it, may be applied to it; if it be not, no such application can be made. This fair and obvious interpretation coincides with, and is enforced by the clause in the Constitution, which declares that "*No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations by law.*" An appropriation of money to the general welfare, would be deemed rather a mockery than an observance of this constitutional injunction."

And after showing that a different exposition of those phrases, would inevitably transform our federal compact into one great consolidated government: the Committee further say, "That the obvious tendency, and inevitable result of a consolidation would be, to transform the republican system of the United States into a monarchy, is a point which seems to have been sufficiently decided by the general sentiment of America."

Here then, is an exposition of those phrases in the Constitution, so full and perspicuous, as to obviate all necessity on my part, to offer any analysis of my own. But I should do injustice to my own feelings, if I did not call the attention of Opimius to a recent *Disquisition* in the Enquirer, in relation to this very subject of "general welfare;" which most fortunately made its appearance in the same paper that contained Opimius's first number; thereby offering the antidote, at the same moment that the "poisoned chalice" was presented.

Let me remind him also, that the foregoing extracts do not exhibit their author's own construction of the Constitution merely, but that it was to this construction, that a large majority of the American people subscribed, when by the "Civil Revolution" of 1801, they snat hed the violated charter of their liberties from the hands of usurpation and power.

Having thus shown, as it is believed, that no su h power exists in the Federal Constitution as Opimius has imagined, let us examine the different examples which he has most unluckily adduced, to show that "every administration from the first to the last," had sustained this doctrine. And here, permit me to offer one or two general observations, to enable us to understand with precision each particular example relied on. It will be readily admitted, I presume, that if any of the acts in question, can be shown to have been based upon any of the *enumerated powers* of the Constitution, or those fairly to be implied from them, that they are not in that case, to be regarded as examples of legislation upon the ground of the "general welfare" merely.—And likewise, I presume, there will be as little difficulty in admitting, that any measure, however clearly it may *promote* the general welfare, yet if it is obviously based upon an *enumerated* power, will be regarded as claiming its validity from such enumerated power; because there is not an enumerated power in the whole instrument, the exercise of which, is not intended to affect the general welfare. These propositions are necessarily conceded by the argument of Opimius, so far as he claims those terms in the Constitution as an independent source of power.

Let us then examine the cases of the purchase of Louisiana and the Floridas. I had supposed that it was well known to every politician, that those a quisitions had been made under that provision of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to "admit new States into the Union;" and by some of their advo ates, they were grounded on the treaty-making power. But the true ground, is the power to admit new States; whi h being a general and unrestricted grant of power, applies equally to States to be formed out of the territory held by the United States at the time of adopting the Federal Constitution, as other countries lying beyond those limits. And if territory be acquired with the fair and bona fide purpose of its admission into the Union after a suitable period of probation, I hold it to be strictly constitutional and proper. The acquisition and subsequent oc-

cupation of the proposed State in the character of *territory*, being in almost every case, a necessary pre-requisite to its admission into the Union, as an independent State. Congress is bound under the Constitution, to guarantee to every State in the Union, a republican form of Government.—Suppose, for example, immediately upon the treaty of cession, Louisiana had been taken into the Federal Union, what would have been the form of her local government?—Certainly not republican. But a miserable despotism under the petty tyranny of her Viceroy. Hence, both the acquisition and the occupation of it as a territory, until a suitable government could be formed, was "necessary and proper" to its admission into the Union, in the form of independent States. And hence, too, it equally follows that the right to acquire and hold territory, being incidental to, and growing out of the right to admit new States, Congress can only exercise that power as auxiliary to such an object, or to some other power expressly conferred by the Constitution. This was the avowed doctrine at the time of the purchase of Louisiana; and no man, I believe, ever heard the "general welfare" intimated, as the foundation of that right. And the treaty of cession itself affords intrinsic evidence of the fact in the 3d article, which contains a provision for its future admission in the Federal Union in the form of independent States.

This was a case of the first impression, and the practice having been settled then, I do not know that a similar provision was introduced into the treaty of cession for the Floridas, (which I have not now before me,) but that the same destiny as to membership in the Federal Union equally awaits them, no person will be idle enough to question.

The next example presented, is the "repeated acquisitions of Indian territory, and the appropriations for ameliorating the condition of the savages." In regard to the acts of the Government in extinguishing Indian title, whether within the ancient limits of the United States, as fixed by the treaty of 1783, or its territory subsequently acquired, they may all, without the least difficulty, be referred, either to the power of Congress to admit new States, and its consequent right to acquire territory for that object, or to the power of Congress "to make all needful rules and regulations" for the government of its territories. In relation to the other branch of the example, "the appropriations for the amelioration of the condition of the savages," I presume allusion is made principally to the act of Congress, passed

March the 30th, 1802, in which, among other things, the President is allowed a sum not exceeding $15,000 annually, to be expended among them in the form of rations, useful domestic animals, implements of husbandry, &c. which, in the very language of the act, is done "to promote civilization among the friendly Indian tribes, and to secure the continuance of their friendship;" and the title of which act is, "An Act to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontiers." With these avowals, both in the title and body of the act, and a knowledge of the influence of such kindnesses upon the savage character, is it not passing strange that your intelligent correspondent should have referred it to any other power than the power of Congress to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and *with the Indian tribes*," and to the treaty-making power; which latter power, is often more beneficially exerted by adopting measures to preserve peace, than by concluding a treaty of peace after war shall have been actually waged? The next example is the act for "the relief of the distressed inhabitants of Caracas." For this act of legislation there is not, to my mind, the slightest warrant in the Constitution; however much to be applauded the feelings which led to it. But that it was passed by Congress, and approved by the President, on the ground of the "general welfare," is utterly denied. The truth is, it was the effusion of a generous and sympathetic feeling, indulged by Congress and the President, without any constitutional objection whatever being raised, as far as I am informed. Can it be seriously believed for a moment, that Mr. Madison, under whose administration the act passed, and who in his official character *approved* the same, would have given this measure his sanction, if the power to pass it had been claimed by its advocates on the ground of the "general welfare"? He, who had been so signally distinguished as the Author of the Report of 1799, and the number of the Federalist before alluded to, could not so readily have forgotten his former opinions. But admitting this to be otherwise; is there not a striking poverty in the argument, which, claiming a particular interpretation of the Constitution as settled by precedent, is enabled only to furnish a single example in support of it, in the long course of time which the American Government has been in operation—an act, too, limited in its influence, and whose object was as little likely to tempt ambition to enlarge its powers, as any other that can be imagined, and passed under circumstan-

ces to rob it of all claims to be regarded as a precedent? A precedent in legislation, as well as in judicial proceedings, can only be considered as such, after the act which is to be cloathed with such sanctity of character has undergone a grave and full discussion, and been solemnly decided, upon the very principle which the precedent is considered as establishing.

But it is said that there are further examples of legislation upon this principle of the general welfare, to be found in the laws "for restoring captured Africans to the homes from which they have been torn, and for the suppression of the slave trade." One could, indeed, have supposed that the deep interest and kind feelings which Opimius seems to have indulged for our whole coloured population, would have presented him with better views upon this subject; and that no zeal, however excessive, for the establishment of a favourite theory, would have betrayed him into the unpardonable error of placing these acts upon any other ground than the well-known power of Congress to "prevent the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States might think proper to admit" until the year 1808; and the power of regulating the foreign commerce of the country.

The two remaining examples of this writer, are if possible still more unhappy. The first is the recent act of Congress to provide the necessary surveys, &c. preparatory to a system of Internal Improvement; and the other "the late act of grateful munificence to the venerable La Fayette." And here permit me to remark, that while I deny to Congress the power which it has claimed and asserted of executing an extensive system of internal improvement by means of roads and canals; it is a subject of no little surprise, that Opimius, with all the advantages of residence, and I doubt not of personal intercourse with the advocates of that policy, should have gravely affirmed that this measure too, was adopted on the ground of the general welfare only. Has he so soon forgotten the nice and varied criticisms, which the debate upon that subject gave rise to, upon certain words in the Constitution; in which the power "to *establish* postoffices and post-roads," was construed by Mr. Clay and others, to mean *construct* postoffices and postroads? Has he also forgotten that other provision of the Constitution which authorizes Congress "to regulate commerce among the several States," which in an equally strange manner, was construed by Mr. McLane and other gentlemen, to mean *facilitate* commerce among the several States? But above all. let him recollect

that Mr. Clay, who was certainly the champion in that discussion, expressly disclaimed the right to pass the bill on any other ground than those above alluded to: and is reported to have used these memorable words; that "if the power could be traced to no more legitimate source, than that of appropriating the public treasure, he yielded the question." And it is furthermore believed, that Mr. McDuffie was the only gentleman in the whole debate, who drew to his aid this sweeping doctrine of the general welfare; at the same time, that he, in common with the other advocates of the measure, contended for the power under the clauses of the Constitution before recited. But the authority of Mr. Monroe may perhaps be quoted upon me; if so, I have only to say, that I believe his best friends would take but little pleasure in referring to his opinions upon this subject, which from the frequent changes they have undergone, may not now be considered as finally settled.

The next and last example, is "the act of grateful munificence to the illustrious La Fayette," which it is well known that Congress, in order to avoid all constitutional difficulty, placed expressly upon the ground of compensation for services rendered; as will appear by reference both to the title and the body of the act. But this, too, in a most singular manner, has escaped the discernment of Opimius; and for which, an intelligent and candid public would hold him responsible, if he had not told us at the beginning, that the business of "controversy was as foreign to his disposition, as it was inconsistent with the ordinary avocations of his life," but in which, unfortunately for his modesty, he appears as an eager volunteer. Having thus shown by an examination of the Constitution itself, as well as the practice of the Government under it, that no such power as that contended for by your correspondent exists, or was ever deliberately acted on by it; I might now safely renew my inquiry for the constitutional powers of Congress to extend its aid and patronage to this Quixotic enterprise. I might here, too, very safely put an end to any further discussion with Opimius upon this subject; as he has already admitted, that private charity is wholly inadequate to the accomplishment of their object, and that the assistance of the Federal Government is indispensably necessary to the further prosecution of their purpose. This course, I should most certainly have pursued, had not the same writer, throughout the whole of his communications, approached with unhallowed hands, though with all the semblances of religion and philanthropy, a subject around which

the Constitution and laws seem in vain to have thrown their best security.

For the purpose of noticing some of his doctrines upon this subject, I may again have occasion to throw myself upon your indulgence. CAIUS GRACCHUS.

To the Editors of the Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: Opimius having staked the last hopes of the Colonization Society, upon the powers of the Federal Government to interpose in its behalf, and to save the whole scheme from abortion, I ought probably to have felt myself contented with the exposition of the Constitution upon this point, as already communicated, and at once terminated the discussion between us. But I have not been able to suppress the belief that I perceived beneath his Roman signature, the language and opinions of some *Vice-President* of the Institution, whose disturbed feelings upon the subject of slavery and of the whole African race, are but the reflected images of the Society to which he belongs. Impressed with this belief, I shall take the liberty of examining with freedom, but I hope with all due *courtesy*, some of the speculations contained in his second and third communications.—And should this examination result in conclusions derogatory to his judgment, or offensive to his sensibility, he will be pleased to consider the misfortune as one of those accidents which are always liable to wound the feelings of gentlemen, who indiscreetly interfere with the long established opinions, and the private rights of their neighbours.

And here, permit me also to remark, that so long as the exercises of religion and philanthropy are confined to their appropriate objects, and seek not to interrupt the political relations of society, we shall often feel ourselves indebted to them, for many of the best and most endearing consolations of life. But when they become tired of restraint, and boldly seek to revolutionize a great principle of labour in the community, upon which the agriculture of half the Union depends, it becomes the duty of a reflecting people to correct their aberrations, and to impose some restraint upon their authors.

Under the influence of these impressions, and a belief that it is necessary to expose some of the wild vagaries of folly, into which the heated advocates of the Colonization Society would involve a confiding and generous people, I shall insti-

tute a very brief inquiry into the *real* character of some of the benefits proposed by Opimius from this Institution, and the means by which they are to be effected; and in the sequel, bestow some notice on the *kind and generous* interference with our most delicate rights, by those States of the Union who neither know the actual condition of slavery among us, its peculiarities, nor the difficulty of legislating upon it: but who, in despite of our remonstrances to the contrary, are "killing us with kindness."

Let us then, in the first place, examine the mildest form in which the Society proposes to dispense its blessings, which is in its proposed removal of the free people of colour from the country. And here I will frankly declare, if I could perceive that the present or any other plan of operations, could attain this single object in good faith, without prejudice to the free people of colour themselves, or without any interference, either directly or indirectly, with the slave population of the country, I should perhaps be among the last citizens of the commonwealth who would raise my voice in opposition. But believing, as I do most conscientiously, that the American Colonization Society, with all its numerous Auxiliaries, are but so many *hotbeds* for the nurture and propagation of principles unfriendly to the tenure of Southern slavery; and that, too, in a mode the most insidious and alarming, I am constrained to regard it with feelings of execration and horror. But disregarding these reflections for a moment, let me ask how is the Society likely to succeed in its attempt to remove the free people of colour from the United States? This can alone be effected by their *consent;* whether the inducements be held out by the hands of private charity, or by the Federal Government. This, it must be obvious at first view, is an indispensable pre-requisite to every movement in their behalf; and until this matter of *consent* is disposed of, to the satisfaction of a reflecting and practical community, Opimius may save himself all the trouble of the very loose guessing in which he has indulged about the expense of his scheme; and the necessity he would be under of proving that the condition of the persons removed would be ameliorated thereby, with a hundred other little matters, which, upon reducing his theories to practice, he would find demanding consideration, and crowding themselves into the estimate. Is it not a fact, well known to every intelligent gentleman in the Southern States, that the free negroes, as a class, are the most inert and lazy beings in all society; and perhaps more averse to emigration than

every thing else that could be required of them? With all the powers of locomotion, they prefer to remain in the county or village where they were born, rather than avail themselves of the many and high inducements to a removal to the non-slave-holding States of the West. Is it not well known that when they do remove, it is always to the deepest haunts of society; to the populous towns and cities on the Atlantic, and not to the rich and fertile countries of the West? This is the natural result of their character and habits. With this strong and prevailing bias on their minds, what must be the character of the inducements that could buy nearly 250,000 of these beings, not only to remove, but to encounter the hazards of a sea voyage, that is to waft them to a "returnless distance" from all the ties and connections which bind them to our country? For be it ever remembered, that in a majority of cases, they would be called on to sever the relations of husband and wife, of parent and child, and all the ties of fraternal kindred which had been formed with the slaves of the country. Upon this subject, I appeal to the observations of every gentleman in the community, and confidently ask, if it is not a matter that comes within his own knowledge, that three-fourths, at least, of the matrimonial connections that take place among the free blacks, are contracted with the slaves? This must necessarily be the case, while there exists no legal or moral restraint to such connections. They are cut off, both by the laws of Virginia and the force of public opinion, from intermarriages with the whites; but this is not the case in relation to our slaves. Hence it might even be safe to estimate the number of their matrimonial connections with the slaves, over those of their own class, in the same proportion that the whole number of slaves bear to the whole number of free people of colour in the United States, which is upwards of six to one.

And can it be necessary that I should remind your intelligent correspondent, that these *natural* and *domestic* relations, are the ties that bind society together, and constitute the strongest ligament by which man is bound to his fellow-man? —more potent by far, than all the artificial relations of society put together. Yet these bonds of connection are considered as presenting no difficulty, and the whole free coloured population of the United States, are presumed to be in readiness, eager to assemble and await the bidding of a wild fanaticism, which is to transport them "to the land of their fathers, elevate them to a higher condition of political freedom, and finally, to carry civilization and refinement to

their benighted brethren in Africa!" These indeed, are the beautiful and sublimated pictures of philanthropy, sketched with all the ardour of enthusiasm, and published, no doubt, with all the sincerity of religion. But let us not be deluded by mere sound. This is a practical political question, demanding at the hands of all reflecting men, a rational and just consideration. Let me then renew the inquiry, is it likely that all those natural ties are to be so easily melted down, and that, too, for the sake of such abstract and promised blessings? And are the free negroes of the country, the chosen subjects, on which such sublime moral influences can be made to operate with success? It is true, the Society has succeeded in the course of about six years, in obtaining the consent of between three and four hundred to emigrate. But without having particular information on the subject, I think I may venture to assert, that out of the whole number, scarcely an instance exists, where any colonist who had a fixed matrimonial connection with a slave, has freely and voluntarily abandoned such connection, to embark in this enterprise. In a majority of cases it is believed, that those who have yielded their consent, have done so from the influence of religious enthusiasm; and are in reality the best portion of our coloured population; while the lazy and immoral part still remain, without the most distant hope of ever obtaining their consent to become volunteers in this scheme; unless, forsooth, they should be made so, as I am told volunteers are sometimes made in Ireland, by a little compulsion. And here allow me to predict, that in the future movements of the Society, there is no difficulty, not even the want of funds, that will present a more serious obstacle, than this *little matter of consent.* Already, if I have been correctly informed, has the Resident Agent been under the necessity of teasing the different Auxiliaries for subjects of transportation: especially since the accession to their funds, from the collections on the 4th of July last: thereby presenting the singular and unnatural spectacle in society, of *charity* begging for objects through the land. But let us bring some of these promised blessings to the only true tests of human wisdom, an unbiased judgment, and a dispassionate reason. And as it is one of the chief objects of this essay, to expose the wild speculations of Opimius and his Society, I shall in the first place, examine that beautiful sentiment, in which it is proposed to return the free people of colour "*to the land of their fathers.*" For this purpose, I will take the liberty of assuming as my propositus, the case of Opimius's body ser-

vant or coachman (for we have his own authority for considering him a slave-holder). Let us suppose him removed in the fourth or fifth generation from his native African ancestors, and already emancipated by his master, and shipped to Africa, for the moral gratification of visiting the land of his fathers, and sharing with the barbarous inhabitants of those regions, the miserable and scanty comforts of life, which fall to the lot of these sons of *Ham*.

In what an awkward and deplorable condition would he find himself? No books of heraldry or even parish registers have preserved the memorials of his nation, or his family. In vain will he apply to the head men of the tribes of Soosoo, Mandingo, Ashantee or Guinea, for the home of his fathers, or any knowledge of his kindred. It is true they came from the great continent of Africa, and he has now the unspeakable pleasure, of settling in some little spot on the same quarter of the globe, in which about one hundred and fifty or two hundred years ago, lived his forefathers. It is also true that during that time his language, his religion, as well as his moral and physical capacities have all been changed; and almost every trait of the African character, corrected by civilization. Let us suppose this subject of his master's benevolence, landed there too during the rainy season, or at a period when the dreadful **Harmattan Winds* are prevailing. Unsheltered and exposed to these scourges of Heaven, he would pitiously make signs of distress and beg for fellowship in some neighbouring clan. But the head men decide in *grand palaver*, that he is a stranger in their land, and perhaps some troubled spirit who has been conjured into existence for the destruction and overthrow of their tribe. Under this impression of his character, should he escape death from their clubs and hatchets, he would probably have to encounter it in a more terrible form, from hunger and the climate. Yet all these considerations avail nothing, when opposed to the pleasure and delight *of returning to the land of his fathers*. But I forbear to press this view of the sub-

*These are certain destructive winds, which are supposed to arise from the face of the great *Lybian Desart* in Africa; and which, though of not long continuance at any one time, visit most parts of the continent at least once or twice a year; not even the seat of the new Colony excepted.

The opinion has been entertained by some, that they contained poisonous properties; but this is probably an error, and their blighting effect on vegetables, as well as their distressing influence on the animal system, are no doubt to be ascribed to the heated and arid character of the winds themselves. But for further information upon this subject, see Mungo Park's travels in the interior of Africa.

ject farther; and have only analyzed this beautiful sentiment that Opimius might contemplate some of the excesses of his club, whilst I held "the mirror up to folly."

But it is proposed to elevate this class of our community to a higher condition of political freedom, than they can with safety be permitted to enjoy in our own country; and that Africa, like America, is to become another theatre for the practice of republican principles and doctrines. This is surely an imposing picture of benevolence, and I hope to be pardoned for questioning its practicability, out of the materials which is to compose the new Colony. Already have I in a former communication reminded the votaries of this scheme, of the fate of the French nation in their late abortive attempt at liberty, founded upon the perfectability of man; and in addition to the suggestions then made, will now respectfully ask, if the history of the world, and all free governments, does not unquestionably prove that political freedom will only abide in communities composed of an enlightened and virtuous population, and that too, after a long acquaintance and habitude with the principles of self-government. What, then, must be thought of the attempt to found a republic which is to be composed of free negroes and mulattoes? Can any reasonable man doubt, but as soon as the Colony shall have swelled to any considerable extent, that any thing but the presence of a strong military force, would be adequate to curb and restrain its dissolute inhabitants? This, no private association would be able to maintain, and should the Federal Government be seduced into this wild enterprise, (which I dare not allow myself to believe,) our country will present the singular spectacle of a nation whose Constitution and political policy, forbid large standing armies in time of peace, as dangerous to liberty; yet, for the sake, and for the necessity too, of preserving liberty, in a remote and distant Colony, supporting at an enormous expense upon a dangerous and sickly coast, an extensive military establishment. Let the politician who would for a moment think of such a state of things, remember the fate of the distant provinces of the Roman Empire under the military government of her Generals and Pro-Consuls, and the facility with which a popular leader always assumed the imperial purple, and gave the whole strength of the Colony the direction of his own ambition. Let him remember the overwhelming debt of England, contracted by sustaining her military in our country during the war of the Revolution. Remove this force, and what at once would become of the political con-

dition of the proposed Colony? Torn by civil feuds, and distracted by the immorality of its inhabitants, it would either degenerate into the worst species of a self-created and barbarous tyranny, or fall an easy prey to the savage tribes by which it was surrounded. Hence, then, a strong military government emanating from the United States, so long as we had the power of continuing it, or a miserable despotism of their own, must be the lot of all those miserable beings who had been seduced from their homes, to go in quest of a higher condition of political freedom in this land of their fathers.

But it is further proposed "to carry civilization and religion to those who have hitherto received at our hands nothing but stripes, and chains, and death." This is, indeed, the most disinterested and sublime part of the whole enterprise: communicated, too, in such strains of rhapsody, as almost to drive reason from her throne, and to make even our judgments tributary to our passions. But, I hope to be pardoned, at least by the practical and thinking part of the community, while I presume to offer some of the reasons on which I have doubted its practicability in the way proposed. Let Opimius consult the pages of authentic history, and learn from them the sad but monitory lesson, that civilized man rarely, if ever, yet made a successful settlement in a barbarous country, that savage man did not recede before him: and while civilization and refinement obtained in their place, it was always at the expense of the lives, the homes, and the religion of the native inhabitants of the country. I have already called the public attention upon this subject, to the fate of the aborigines of North and South America. I will now remind Opimius of the Burmese and Ashantee wars which are at this moment waging between the wretched inhabitants of those countries, and the settlements of the English in Africa and the East Indies. The English profess the same religion with ourselves, and are doubtless, as a people equally charitable and humane; and certainly much more so, than would be the coloured inhabitants of this new Colony. Yet the cruelties and exactions of her Governors in the East Indies upon the natives of the country, are familiar to all; and so long as the prosecution of Hastings, and the sublime eloquence of Sheridan is remembered, humanity must weep over the sufferings and injustice which the history of that trial discloses. And this, although an aggravated case, and rendered notorious only, because of the prosecution which it gave rise to, is

sufficient to evince the general character of the intercourse between those obtrusive settlers and the native inhabitants of the country, and to fix this melancholy truth in our minds, that power and avarice when opposed to weakness, never yet failed to feed their own cupidity. Let me not be told by the admirers of this Quixotic scheme, that the history of the world presents no example of a colony, planted with the same benevolent views, as the new settlement at Liberia, and that in the cases alluded to, commerce and ambition have been the leading incentives. This might with safety, and perhaps truth be admitted; and yet until its advocates could show, that the population which is to compose the Colony, would be exempt from all the frailties and passions, which are inseparably attached to the human character, and fill up the measure of man's infirmity, the reasoning from past experience must still obtain. It is man, poor, frail, and infirm man, who must at last people this Colony. And, unfortunately for this part of the scheme, the Colonists themselves are to be drawn from the most corrupt and dissolute part of our species.

Having thus exposed some of the most prominent of the wild fantasies of Opimius and his associates, I shall designedly bestow but little notice on that very ludicrous notion of his, which would invoke the aid of the "National Government" for this enterprise, on the ground of the improvement of our navigation, by the annual transportation of 30,000 souls to the coast of Africa, for the period of a few years; because, until this *little matter of consent* on the part of the free blacks thus to be shipped to Africa, for the want of a better cargo, is fully settled, any argument on this point would be premature and useless. I cannot refrain, however, from reminding him, that the navigating interest of the United States is ever destined to be prosperous and gainful, without the aid of such helps, so long as our commerce remains unshackled by foreign wars or domestic restrictions. With a sea border that stretches itself along the whole of our Eastern and Southern boundary; with numerous majestic rivers penetrating the country in all directions, and the productions of a continent at our command, already does the American canvass spread itself to every wind, and our hardy tars are to be found in every port in the world. Add to these, the genius and enterprise of our people; and no man can doubt the proud destiny which must ultimately await the commercial marine of this country. With these great natural capacities and advantages, how inconsiderable

and transient must be the influence to be derived from the shipment of forty or fifty cargoes of free negroes, for the space of a few years!

Permit me now to bestow a very brief notice upon the defence which has been set up by your correspondent, for the interference of his Society with our slave population; and the officious and intermeddling resolves of some of our sister States upon the same subject, and which he has been pleased to consider as the "generous offer of others to participate in the burthen of removing an evil from ourselves," and as "originating in a spirit of generous magnanimity, and a most delicate and scrupulous regard to the rights, privileges, and feelings of the South." And is Opimius really in earnest, when he undertakes to tell Southern gentlemen, that this teasing interference by strangers with their most delicate and private rights, is altogether compatible with the principles of true delicacy, and a proper regard for their feelings; especially, too, when it is seen that every advance is repelled by insult and reproaches: And when, notwithstanding our disgust, we are hung upon with meretricious fondness, by those very "*scrupulous and delicate*" *friends*, until we are threatened by the agency of the Federal Government, to be despoiled of that very property which the Constitution of the country was intended to secure? And what is still more remarkable, these, too, are the sentiments of a writer who tells us himself that he is a Virginian and a slave-holder, and whom we are bound to believe is *really* a lover of *courtesy* and good manners.

It is also said, that these most "delicate and magnanimous" friends of ours, have in like manner manifested a scrupulous regard for our *rights* and *privileges*, as well as our feelings, in relation to this species of our property. If this be so, then indeed have they been unkindly treated; and the Legislatures of all the slave-holding States, as well as their executive officers, through whom these offensive resolves have been communicated, have alike wholly mistaken their character and tendency.

And can it be necessary that I should remind your correspondent, that in the case of the Ohio resolves, which have been obtrusively thrust into the face of every Legislature in the Union, not a single instance can be found in which a slave-holding State has understood them in any other character than that which I have ascribed to them; while, on the other hand, the *non-slave-holding* States to whom they have been presented, unite in one accord to bestow on them their

most unqualified approbation? This single fact, while it marks with unerring certainty the true character of the proceeding, should present an instructive and awful admonition to those pseudo-philanthropists, that this is a question upon the decision of which the preservation of the Union must depend. And with the avowals of Opimius in behalf of these very measures, and his declaration of the ultimate objects of his Society, who is there that can doubt the inductility of their purpose, and the existence at *least* of a moral connection between them? Is it not apparent, from the very terms of those resolves, that they all seek to effect their object through the medium of *colonization?* And why so? Because it is the most insidious and least suspicious mode of attack upon us. But what need is there of proofs and illustrations upon this subject? Already has this writer boldly avowed, that "the removal of the coloured population of the country is a consummation devoutly to be wished for;" and that his Society has been "labouring with the most untiring zeal to demonstrate, by experiment, the possibility of effecting it." Is this language, about which gentlemen can be mistaken? In vain shall we be told of the "quiet and unobtrusive means which the Society has employed to effect their object." We know full well the character of our slave population; and while most other subjects of property can only be affected by an abduction of some of its parts, or an actual contact with it, it is one peculiarity of this species of property, that, to render it discontented, is at once the most effectual means of destroying it.

But I will not pursue this view of the subject further. The consequences to which a perseverance in this part of the scheme directly leads, are of the most awful and overwhelming character; and while the *real philanthropist* must shudder in the contemplation of its sequel, the patriot who correctly views it, will perceive in its consummation the overthrow of that Union, under which *rational liberty* had chosen to locate itself, and whose residence beneath its shelter was supposed to be eternal. I shall therefore content myself with having, on the present occasion, exposed some of the wild excesses of folly, into which even sensible men have been betrayed by their feelings; and into which others, less reflecting, have been seduced by the "bead-roll of excellent and honourable names," which have been most studiously prefixed to the proceedings of this Society: and will in future rely upon the good sense of my country to root up from among us those hotbeds of insurrection and mischief, which

fanaticism and folly have planted in the form of Auxiliaries to the Colonization Society at Washington.

CAIUS GRACCHUS.

To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: I have too much respect for the intelligence of Caius Gracchus, to suppose him incapable of understanding a plain proposition, submitted in very plain terms; and too much confidence in his candour, to believe that he would willingly misrepresent an antagonist for any purpose whatever. I can account, therefore, for his having attributed to me, sentiments which I never entertained, and quoted from me, expressions which I never used, only from the extraordinary effect, invariably produced on politicians "of the school to which he belongs," by a reference, no matter how cautiously guarded, or how innocently intended, to certain general expressions, to be found in the Constitution of the United States. I never did, either directly or by the most remote implication, claim for the General Government, an authority *to do whatever it believed would be conducive to* "the common defence, and the general welfare of the nation." Nor did I ever assert that such a doctrine had been conceded "by a large proportion of the wisest and best men of our country;" nor "that it had been sustained by the uniform practice of every administration, from the first to the last." I did however assert, (and I repeat it,) that the authority *to appropriate money* to objects, merely because of their connection with "the common defence, and the general welfare," had been thus conceded, and thus sustained; and I still rely on the facts, that have been, and that may be adduced, to justify the assertion.

General Hamilton, it is admitted, claimed such an authority for the Government. Mr. McDuffie assumed it as one of the grounds of justification for *appropriations* to internal improvement. And it was the only consideration, by which Mr. Monroe could be induced to sign a bill, providing the necessary means for repairing the Cumberland road. Mr. Adams has asserted the doctrine in the most unqualified terms. Mr. Calhoun has maintained it with very great ability on more than one occasion: And I am very much mistaken if Mr. Lowndes and Mr. Cheves will not be found to have been amongst its most eloquent, and most powerful ad-

vocates on the floor of Congress. I might go on to multiply evidences, that the doctrine had been conceded "by a large proportion of the wisest and best men of the country," but I presume enough has been said to satisfy even Caius Gracchus on this subject, unless, indeed, wisdom and excellence are claimed, as the exclusive attributes of the "chosen few" with whom he has thought proper to associate himself in politics.

But I have been guilty also, it would seem, of the "extravagancy" of declaring that the same doctrine "had been sustained by the uniform *practice* of every administration, from the first to the last," and I have escaped the indignant astonishment of my ingenious opponent, only by an honest exhibition of the examples relied on to prove the correctness of the declaration. May I crave his indulgent forbearance yet a little longer, while I endeavour to show that these examples are not so entirely irrelevant, as he seems to think them? In doing so, I shall purposely abstain from all reference to the administrations of Washington and the elder Adams. Their's were days of Federal predominance, and we must of course presume, of latitudinarian construction. And although it has since been discovered, that "there were more things in heaven and earth, than were dreamt of in their philosophy," yet I would not tempt the indignant ire of my opponent, by appealing to an authority, in connection with which he was taught, perhaps, to *lisp* the odious epithet of "*the reign of terror.*" Nor will I attempt to sustain myself by the acts of Mr. Monroe, "to whose opinions on this subject," it seems, "even his best friends," (Caius Gracchus, I presume, and a certain twice-discomfited chieftain) "would take but little pleasure in referring." I prefer to confine myself to an authority, which cannot be contested—to those golden days of the republic, when the question is said to have been, not how *much* power was necessary to administer the government *well*, but with how *little* it could be administered *at all;* and if I should show, that even in those days, *appropriations* were occasionally made, which, if not justified on the ground, that they were required by "the common defence, and the general welfare," must either be wholly without authority, or must rest for their justification on a rule of construction, infinitely more extended and more alarming, than any that has hitherto been suggested.—If I can show this, I trust I shall stand acquitted of indiscretion, in attempting to sustain myself by the *practice* "of every administration, from the first to the last."

The acquisition of Louisiana, it will be recollected, was effected during the administration of Mr. Jefferson. And notwithstanding the time that has since elapsed, I have never, until now, heard the suggestion, that it was made, either with a view to add to the number of the States, or under the authority given to Congress "to admit new States into the Union." The fact is, that from the peculiar situation of Louisiana, "the common defence and general welfare" of our country, required that it should belong to us, rather than to any foreign power. This consideration, and this alone, suggested the propriety of obtaining it. And as the people, in the plenitude of their wisdom, had confided to the President and Senate, the authority "to make treaties," and to Congress, the power "to lay and collect taxes" for the express purpose of "providing for the common defence and promoting the general welfare," there could be no doubt of the propriety of the application of these powers to a measure so eminently conducive, as was the purchase of Louisiana, to the purpose for which they had been granted—there was no necessity for looking beyond *them*, for an authority to make the purchase—and least of all, was there any *constitutional obligation* to provide for the future admission of the purchased territory into the Union? The treaty of acquisition, it is true, contained such a provision—but it was a matter of expediency, and not of constitutional necessity. It grew out of the impression, that it would be better to invest with the rights and prerogatives of a State, a territory which our interests required should be forever connected with us, than to retain it, in perpetual territorial or colonial dependence. Had the public interest required, or would it even have been satisfied, by a *temporary* possession of Louisiana, can it be doubted, that the powers of the Government would have been fully adequate to acquire such possession? Should the day ever arrive, when the purchase of Cuba shall be the only means of preventing it from becoming an instrument in the hands of a foreign power, for our annoyance or destruction, shall the purchase be prevented or its value diminished, by the necessity of admitting its corrupted and degraded and remote inhabitants to all the rights and privileges and immunities of our own citizens? And yet such must be the consequence of the doctrine of Caius Gracchus—such must be the inevitable and the absurd consequence of deducing the right to acquire territory exclusively from the authority "to admit new States into this Union."

But truly, Messrs. Editors, this power of admitting States, is a most comprehensive and alarming one, in the hands of your correspondent. It not only invests the Government with unlimited authority for the acquisition of foreign territory, but it introduces it with its abundant resources, and its overwhelming prerogatives, within the jurisdiction of States already admitted, and even into the very heart and centre of the thirteen old United States. Here, too, it seems Indian titles may be extinguished, and Indian territory purchased for the purpose, and under the authority, "not of appropriating money," and "making treaties" "for the common defence and general welfare," but "of admitting new States into this Union." And lest the common sense of the community should be startled, and the jealous fears of the States alarmed, at so extravagant a proposition, your ready-witted correspondent has presented an alternative, objectionable only in this, that it imposes on his political friends, (one article of whose creed, I believe, is, that no incidental power can be exercised by the Government, but such as is *absolutely necessary* for the execution of its enumerated powers,) an obligation to show that "the repeated acquisitions of Indian territory," during the administrations of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison, were *absolutely necessary* to the execution of their power "to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States."

The next example which I had cited to show the *practice* of the Government in relation to appropriations, was the annual expenditure of a considerable sum, "in ameliorating the condition of the savages." That the propriety of this expenditure had been suggested by its obvious tendency "to insure the domestic tranquillity," and "to promote the general welfare" of our own country, I did not suppose could admit of a doubt, and the connection between such objects and the specified power of raising and appropriating revenue, was so palpable, that I deemed it unnecessary to search further for an authority to accomplish them: Caius Gracchus, however, disclaims as usual, on the part of his favourite administrations, such unhallowed objects, and triumphantly sustains himself, by the declaration in the act itself, that it was done "to promote civilization among the friendly Indian tribes, and to secure the continuance of their friendship." And where does this learned commentator find an authority for effecting these purposes of benevolence and patriotism? The preamble to the Constitution, which de-

signates all the objects for which the Government was instituted, and its powers distributed, contains no direct allusion to the Indian tribes; and to civilize them, and conciliate their friendship, are accordingly purposes which the Government has no right even to attempt, except so far as they are connected with that "general welfare," to avoid which, your correspondent seems prepared, either "to fly, to swim, to dive into the fire, or to ride in the curled clouds."

But the title of the act, is "an act to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes," &c. and as the power is expressly given to Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, *and with the Indian tribes*," it is passing strange in the estimation of Caius Gracchus, that I should have looked to any other authority to justify the appropriation in question. And has it indeed come to this? Is this devoted champion of "State rights," this jealous advocate for limited construction, who has already shown that he can "cavil on the ninth part of a hair," prepared to depend on the title of an act for the justification of its provisions? Or will he admit, that under an authority "to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes," it was allowable to expend large sums of money in establishing schools, and in the gratuitous distribution of rations, useful domestic animals, implements of husbandry, &c.? If so, what extravagant deductions may not be drawn from a similar power in relation to "foreign nations?" And who will pretend to deny, that under an authority "to regulate commerce among the several States," Congress may contribute to the comfort and improvement, physical, as well as mental, of their numerous inhabitants? Or, who shall set bounds to the overwhelming *commercial* blessings that may be showered on us, in the shape of roads and canals, and schools and colleges? It was but lately, Messrs. Editors, that you undertook to win back to the fold from which he had strayed, a wanderer of the mountain. May I be pardoned, for recommending to the same kind and considerate attention, your errant pupil of the lowlands? One more number on "constitutional construction," without previous communication by signal or otherwise, with Richmond, and Caius Gracchus is lost to you forever!

The last example cited from the days that intervened between the termination of one inadmissible authority, and the commencement of another, was the appropriation "for the relief of the distressed inhabitants of Caracas." On this example, your correspondent fairly acknowledges himself at

fault. Even the process of Procrustes fails him here; and his favourite and all-comprehending powers "of admitting new States," providing the needful rules for the government of territories, "and regulating commerce with the Indians," having defied his utmost efforts to stretch them to the dimensions of this "simple effusion of a generous and sympathetic feeling," he is compelled in despair, to pronounce it "an act without the slightest warrant in the Constitution." But he stoutly denies that the appropriation was approved by Mr. Madison, on the ground, that by its conciliating tendency in relation to foreign nations, it was calculated to promote "the general welfare" of our own country. And his reason for the denial, is, the utter impossibility that he "who had been so signally distinguished as the Author of the Report of 1799, should so readily have forgotten his former opinions." If Caius Gracchus will examine that celebrated Report, "the richest offering which genius and patriotism ever gave to an admiring country," he will find the greater portion of it devoted to proving that the Government of the U. States is a limited government, and that it can do nothing without a constitutional warrant, nothing without a specific authority. Whether, therefore, Mr. Madison signed the bill in question without any warrant at all, or because he believed it contained an appropriation calculated "to promote the general welfare" of the country, is a matter of but little consequence. He must, in either case, have forgotten or intentionally abandoned the principles of his Report. And that he did not consider these principles as a suitable guide for his "*practical administration*" is clearly evinced, not only by the various acts to which I have already referred, but most especially by that act which gave existence to the present National Bank. This fact is adverted to, not in the spirit of reproach to Mr. Madison. In my humble opinion, it reflects the highest honour on him. It was the triumph of patriotism over the pride of opinion—it was the substitution of wholesome practice for brilliant but deceptive theory—it was the magnanimous concession of genius to experience.

In thus reviewing the various evidences which I have heretofore adduced, of the practical construction of the Constitution by different administrations, I might go on, Messrs. Editors, to find food for merriment as well as wonder, in the efforts of a mind, which could deduce the right to suppress the slave trade, from an authority "to regulate foreign commerce;" which could trace an appropriation of $100,000 for restoring captured Africans to their homes, to the restriction

imposed on Congress, of prohibiting, before a certain period, "the migration or importation of such persons, as the States might think proper to admit;" and which prefers to look for the real character of "the late act of grateful munificence to the venerable La Fayette," to its title, rather than to its provisions: but in doing so, I should be under the necessity of resorting to an authority, to which Caius Gracchus "would take but little pleasure in referring." I content myself, therefore, as he denies the right of Congress to appropriate money to internal improvement, with quoting for his edification, the following instances of appropriation on this subject, under the administrations of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison, viz: $30,000 to making a road from Cumberland to the Ohio; 6,000 to a road from Nashville to Natchez; 6,400 to a road from Athens in Georgia, to the 31st degree of North latitude; 6,000 to a road from the Mississippi to the Ohio; 8,000 to a road from Shawneetown to Kaskaskia, 10,000 to repairing a road between Columbia in Tennessee, and Madisonville in Louisiana; and at different times, upwards of $1,000,000, to completing the Cumberland road. Whether these appropriations were made under the authority "to admit new States into the Union," "to provide the needful rules for the government of territories," "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," &c. or to refrain until 1808, from prohibiting the migration, or importation of a certain description of persons," I will not undertake to decide. I am content, for my own part, to consider them as so many additional examples "of the uniform practice" of appropriating money to "the common defence, and the general welfare" of the country.

Having thus shown what has been the practice of the Government, it now remains to demonstrate the conformity of that practice, with the theory of the Constitution, and with the only fair and legitimate rule of construction, that can be applied to that stupendous effort of wisdom and foresight. The instrument in question, contains in its *preamble*, a clear and explicit designation of the objects proposed to be accomplished, and in its *body*, a specification equally clear and explicit of the means by which these objects are to be accomplished. As the one restricts the views, the other imposes a necessary limit on the operations of the Government. And although in its progress, it should become desirable to aim at other objects than the preamble authorizes, or to accomplish those objects by other means than the Constitution designates, it can do neither the one nor the other. without first appealing

to the people for an enlargement of its powers. Whenever, therefore, a measure is proposed for the adoption of any department of the Government, the first question to be asked in relation to it, is, whether it be calculated "to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, or to secure the blessing of liberty to the people of the United States and their posterity;" and should the question be decided affirmatively in relation to all or any one of these objects, the only remaining consideration is, whether the means of accomplishing it can be found among the delegated powers of the Government, or among the incidental powers having a proper relation to, and being, in the language of the Constitution, "necessary and proper" for carrying into execution the delegated powers. If this cannot be done, the measure must, of course, be abandoned; but if it can, the measure is fairly within the purview of the Constitution, and all the powers and resources of the Government may be applied to its accomplishment.

Such then is the rule,* and the only rule by which the

* The correctness of this rule, and its application to *the greater part of the enumerated powers* of the Government, have been uniformly acquiesced in. Some difference of opinion has existed as to the extent of *the incidental powers*—that might be claimed under it; and a certain class of politicians seem disposed to resist, as though the salvation of the Republic depended upon it—its application to the *appropriating* power of the Government. Congress is specially authorized, amongst other things, "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; to pay the debts, and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;" and yet, by a strange disregard of the obvious import of the terms used, it is denied the power of applying the proceeds of those taxes, &c. to the very objects for which they were intended; unless through the instrumentality and in aid of its *other enumerated* powers. If this be correct, why, it may be asked, was the power placed amongst, and at the very head of the *enumerated* powers? Why was it not left among the *incidental means* "necessary and proper" for executing the *enumerated* powers? Or, at all events, if from abundant caution, it was deemed necessary to designate it, why was it not declared in terms—"that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises;" not "to pay the debts, and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States," but "to execute the following powers, &c."? The reason assigned in the report of '98, for its extraordinary construction of this clause of the Constitution, is its necessity for guarding the rights of individuals and of the States against encroachment: for if, in the view of the author of the report, Congress may under its authority, "to lay and collect taxes, &c.," apply the proceeds of those taxes to every measure calculated "to promote the common defence and general welfare;" it may in effect accomplish every purpose within the range of legislation, and thus defeat the object of the subsequent enumeration of its powers. This reasoning would be perfectly correct, if the power to appropriate money to an object, drew after it, as

various acts of every administration can be made to stand the test of the most rigid constitutional scrutiny. And such is the rule which the American Colonization Society, now asks, may be applied to a measnre, as intimately associated with "the domestic tranquillity, the common defence, and the general welfare" of the country, as any, which the human mind can conceive, or the human heart desire.

OPIMIUS.

To the Editors of the Richmond Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: If the public were interested in learning, that, under one Roman signature, they had been presented with "the language and opinions of some *Vice-President* of an Institution whose disturbed feelings on the subject of slavery, and the whole African race, are but the reflected images of the Society to which he belongs," they would learn perhaps with equal interest, that under another Roman signature, they have a picture to the life of a county court advocate, whose pretensions to anticipated favours must rest in a degree on the extravagance of his constitutional opinions, and on his ability to minister to the prejudices of a large proportion of his fellow-countymen. But I take it for granted, that whatever of interest has been felt in the discussion between Caius Gracchus and myself, has attached rather to the subject discussed, and the opinions maintained, than to the authority of our names, or our dignities; and I accord-

a necessary consequence, the power to accomplish that object. But the power to appropriate and the power to execute, are two distinct things. The one may be used in aid of the interests, but never in violation of the rights, either of the States or of individuals. The other on the contrary, may in promoting the general good, interfere with both the claims of individuals and the jurisdiction of the States. The power to appropriate money, for example, to roads and canals, is limited to the simple act of appropriation. But the power to make roads and canals, would authorize their location and protection, either with or without consent, on the property of any individual, and within the jurisdiction of any State. So, too, an authority to create a fund, as proposed by Mr. King, "to aid in the emancipation and removal of such slaves, as may by the laws of the several States be authorized to be emancipated and removed," could not in any possible mode interfere with the rights either of the States or of individuals. But a power "to emancipate and remove" the slaves within the limits of a State, would be a most alarming power of interference with both. There is obviously, therefore, a very good reason why the *active* powers of the Government should be specified and defined, while the power of appropriation should be limited only by the general interests of the country.

ingly pass from a personal allusion, which I would gladly have avoided, to a very brief notice of the last communication of this open and devoted *advocate of slavery.*

The mode in which he has thought proper, in this communication, to treat the views of the Colonization Society, is neither new nor ingenious. Its prototype will be found in the speeches and publications in Great Britain against *the abolition of the slave trade.* Against that glorious effort of the wisest and the greatest statesmen the world had ever seen, the subtlety of professional genius, the powers of brilliant sarcasm, and the overwhelming influence of barefaced misrepresentation, were successively essayed. The charges of wild fanaticism and religious enthusiasm, were especially urged with all the zeal of trembling interest, and all the fury of disappointed avarice. The hopeless degradation of Africa, its incapacity for improvement, and its fitness only for ministering to the wants of civilized man, were presented in bold relief. The dangers and the expense of interference with the long-established usage of the world, were thrown in terrific array before the eyes of a calculating people; and even justice and humanity were most impiously appealed to, not merely for the protection of property already acquired, but for the perpetuation of a traffic, whose subjects were human beings, and whose instruments were force and fraud, and perjury and rapine. But a recurrence to fundamental principles was most carefully avoided. The arguments drawn by the friends of abolition, from the acknowledged rights of man, and from the holy precepts of the Christian faith, were either shunned as dangerous topics, or ridiculed as the suggestions of busy fanaticism. Every obstacle was thrown in the way of a fair and candid investigation of the cruelties inseparable from the trade. And the great and lasting interests of the nation were sought to be hid from the public view, by a glittering exhibition of the temporary increase of its revenue, and of the rapid accumulation of individual wealth.

In the same spirit, and (with very little variation) in the same manner, have the views of the Colonization Society been treated by this modern advocate of domestic slavery. In a communication professing to be a full and triumphant reply to all that has been urged in support of the Society, its real objects have been either totally disregarded, or adverted to, only to be misrepresented. The infinite importance to the nation of removing a confessedly injurious population, has been kept entirely out of view, and the public at-

tention been drawn to the exclusive contemplation of petty details, and of those considerations of religion and philanthropy, which, though entering into, and inseparably connected with the plans of the Colonization Society, neither constitute the foundation on which they rest, nor are indispensable to their success. But *details* are certain fields of triumph to county court ingenuity; and religion and philanthropy are ever fruitful themes of sarcasm and invective, to the thoughtless and the licentious. Aware of this, and sensible of the deep and general conviction of the public mind, as to the evils entailed upon us by our coloured population, Caius Gracchus has most carefully avoided those powerful considerations of national interest, which call for their removal, and has directed the whole force of his wit and genius, sometimes against difficulties of his own creation, and sometimes against those less general, and therefore less imposing arguments, which were addressed exclusively to the humane and generous feelings of the nation. How far he has succeeded, even in this insidious mode of attack, will readily appear from a very slight examination of its most important points.

The charge of mischievous enthusiasm, urged with a modesty and decorum, worthy of the signature under which it is exhibited, needs no other refutation than is furnished by the deep and heartfelt interest in the operations of the Colonization Society, publicly manifested by such men as Chief Justice Marshall, Judge Washington, Mr. Clay, and Mr. Crawford.* Before Caius Gracchus can hope to excite the suspicions, or to arouse the indignation of his fellow-citizens against men like these, he must have established for himself a reputation derived from some other source than the conflicts of a county court, and extending beyond the limits of a newspaper circulation. When he shall have exhibited in the councils of the State, that profound practical wisdom, which we have a right to anticipate from his elo-

*To these names might doubtless have been added that of Mr. Jefferson, had not this distinguished philosopher retired from the theatre of public action, before the Society commenced its operations. His sentiments on the subject, however, are generally known. His exertions, while in the Presidential chair, were most anxiously directed towards procuring on the coast of Africa, a settlement to which the free negroes might be sent. And I now have before me a letter of his, dated in 1811, in which, after declaring his willingness to do every thing in his power to give effect and security to any establishment that might be attempted, he emphatically says, "*Nothing is more to be wished than that the United States would themselves undertake to make such an establishment on the coast of Africa*"! ! !

quent denunciations of what he is pleased to consider visionary enthusiasm,—when he shall have succeeded in arresting "the downward course" of the land of his nativity, and when he shall have demonstrated by its actual improvement, moral as well as physical, the manifold blessings of domestic slavery;—then, and not till then, may he hope to transfuse into the public mind, some share of "the execration and horror," with which he is disposed to visit the opinions of so large and so respectable a portion of his fellow-citizens.

A very moderate share of reflection could not have failed to diminish his confidence in the natural propensities of the negro, as an insurmountable obstacle in the way of his removal; and the recollection of a few facts of general notoriety, would have reduced to its proper dimensions, "that little matter of consent" on which, in the fulness of his zeal, he dwells with such unceasing delight. Human nature is the same in every region and under every colour. Heaven has implanted in us a solicitude for the improvement of our condition, from which even the acknowledged sluggishness of the negro does not entirely exempt him; and facts may be adduced to show, that "aversion to emigration," is not so powerful a principle in his composition, as to stifle every other feeling of his degraded nature. We surely are the last people in the world who ought to anticipate difficulties from such a source—we, who are living witnesses of the progressive advances of millions of freemen, sprung almost exclusively from the emigrants of a single island;—we, who are daily contemplating the eagerness with which thousands of our fellow-citizens are deserting the homes of their fathers, and the graves of their ancestors, for the trackless forests of the West. And does a difference of complexion really create so radical a difference in the human character? Will the white man leave a comfortable home, the circle of his friends, and the ties of his nativity, merely in pursuit of additional wealth, while neither poverty nor oppression will stimulate the negro to exertion? If, as is averred, the latter, "with all the powers of loco-motion, prefers to remain in the county or village where he was born, rather than avail himself of the many and high inducements to a removal to the non-slave-holding States of the West," is not his preference accounted for by the fact, that these inducements are neither as many nor as high as they are supposed to be—that they offer him no improvement in his social, his civil, or his political condition—and above all,

that they require him to leave a State, where he is elevated at least one degree in the scale of humanity, and to place himself amongst those, with whom he is to rank the lowest of the low? If, too, when he does move, (and the power of motion it seems is not entirely denied him) "it is to the populous towns and cities on the Atlantic, rather than to the rich and fertile countries of the West," is not his choice determined by the comparative facilities offered him, for acquiring all that the laws of the country and the feelings of society will permit him to acquire? Why, then, if a situation can be presented, still more alluring, and furnishing greater facilities for acquisition, and a wider field for enjoyment, why are we to apprehend that he will be unwilling to avail himself of it? It cannot be forgotten, that in the course of a single season, six thousand of this inert race were tempted to the shores of Hayti; and that even in the infant and unprotected state of the settlement at Liberia, a thousand more have been induced to "encounter the hazards of a sea voyage," and to essay "its returnless distance."

But the Resident Agent, we are told, has been under the necessity "of teasing the different Auxiliaries for subjects of transportation." If the fact be so, (and it might certainly have come through a less objectionable channel.) is it to be wondered at, that in the present actual condition of the Colony, and under the operation of the grossest misrepresentations with regard to the intentions of its founders, difficulties should sometimes exist in particular sections of the country, in procuring at a moment's warning, the requisite number of emigrants for a voyage? Had Caius Gracchus allowed himself to enter upon a candid examination of the Reports of the Society, which he seems hitherto to have read, only in the spirit in which the Atheist reads his Bible, he would have learned, that whatever may have been the fact in relation to a single expedition, the candidates for emigration have very generally exceeded the Society's means for transportation.—And the late appeal of the Agent to the generous feelings of the public, must have satisfied him, that notwithstanding "the accession to its funds from the collections of the 4th of July last," the Society is at this moment labouring under a more serious difficulty than "this little matter of consent."

But the defeat of the whole plan of colonization, is most triumphantly anticipated, from the necessity it is supposed to involve, of disturbing certain domestic relations subsisting between the free negroes and the slaves; and with an air of most imposing confidence, an appeal is made "to the ob-

servation of every gentleman in the community," for the fact, "that *three-fourths at least*, of the matrimonial connections that take place among the free blacks, are contracted with slaves." Can it be necessary to remind your correspondent, that *nearly one-half* of the free coloured population of the country, reside in States where slavery does not exist; or that in relation to the other half, it has been a peculiar part of our Southern policy to discourage, as far as possible, their association with our slaves? And so far has the policy succeeded in this part of the country, that in a neighbourhood, having its full share, both of slaves and free negroes, a matrimonial connection between them, is an incident of very rare occurrence. But even were it otherwise, an ingenuity less brilliant, or a sagacity less profound, than has fallen to the lot of Caius Gracchus, would find no difficulty in devising means, by which the removal of this wretched population might be effected, without disturbing those "natural and domestic relations," which have called into such powerful action, the latent feelings of his heart. It argues indeed but little confidence in the patriotism and benevolence of the community in which he lives, to suppose that an object, whose importance, even he is constrained to admit, would be permitted to fail for want of a miserable pittance from the hand of charity.

But it is against the idea of restoring our coloured population to the land of their fathers, elevating them to a higher degree of political freedom, and using them as instruments for carrying civilization and religion to the shores of Africa, that the varied powers of your correspondent are most successfully displayed. To his happy illustrations, and to his successful effort in "holding the mirror up to folly," I bear a willing testimony. Neither "Womba the son of Witless," nor that "pretty Knave" of Lear's, nor indeed any other member of the fraternity of jesters, ever established a fairer claim to "the cap with bells," or the "sword of lath:" and if the spirit of self-complacency was, at any time, more conspicuously the result of *their* successful sallies; historical justice has not been done them, in the records of their deeds and sayings.

I am no great stickler for "the perfectability of man;" but, I confess myself somewhat startled, when I hear a citizen of a republican country, seriously discouraging all attempts at improving the condition of his fellow-creatures, on the ground of the failure "of the French nation in their late abortive attempts at liberty." Other periods, and other incidents

would have furnished examples more favourable to the character of man, and to the cause of republicanism. The progress of events in the southern part of our own continent ought to inspire us with a hope, that human nature can never be too degraded for improvement; and the actual condition of Hayti, furnishes the most incontrovertible evidence, that even the negro character is not wholly unsusceptible of both moral and political elevation. But, at Sierra Leone, an experiment precisely similar to our own has been made, under the auspices of the British Government; and its entire success in relation both to the character and condition of the settlers, leaves us no room to doubt that the coloured population of our country might, in Africa, attain to a higher degree of civil and political freedom, than they can ever be permitted to enjoy here. The happy influence, too, exercised by the same settlement over the tribes in its immediate vicinity, ought to inspire us with a hope that the same interesting results could not fail to flow from a similar settlement established under the auspices of our own Government.

With respect to the alleged interference of the non-slave-holding States, I need add but little to what I have already said. The rudeness with which Caius Gracchus exultingly proclaims their advances to have been met, was confined, (I believe, to the polished Governor Burton, and the——unfortunate Governor Troup. The Executives and Legislatures of some of the other States have disagreed to the resolutions of Ohio, but it has been in language, and in a mode, neither disgraceful to themselves, nor mortifying to their country. Others, on the contrary, while they have forborne to act on the subject as presented by Ohio, have not hesitated to avow themselves, decidedly favourable to the removal and colonization of the free people of colour. Delaware, Maryland, Tennessee, and in a moment of less excitement, even Georgia, all slave-holding States, have, at different times, expressed their approbation of the plan. And Virginia, not satisfied with resolving, has furnished a more substantial evidence of her opinion, by an appropriation of $500 to an expedition that was fitted out during the last year. With these evidences before us, I think it fair to infer, that when present excitements shall have passed away, we shall recur with feelings of grateful approbation, to the generous offers of our Northern and Western brethren.

I have thus, Messrs. Editors, noticed very briefly, as I promised to do, the most important considerations contained in the only reply vouchsafed to the various arguments urged

in favour of colonizing the free people of colour; and, yet, I can hardly be said to have touched on a single idea of much importance to the plan, or to have answered a single argument, which might not have been disregarded, without detriment to my cause. The great object of the Colonization Society, is *the removal from our country, of a population confessedly injurious to its interests.* It is in this point of view, "a practical, political question," and as such, we of the South, at least, are "deeply interested" in a rational and just consideration of it. Allow me, then, to ask, if it can be brought too early to our view, or pressed with too much zeal on our attention? The evils which have given rise to it, have already made their way into our society,—they are perceptible in our institutions, both civil and political,—and their all-pervading influence is felt in the very sources of our wealth and strength. We have, in the midst of us, a numerous and continually increasing population, which I have described, (correctly, I think,) in a former number, as "differing from us in habits, as in colour.—idle, because deriving from wealth but few of its most valuable privileges—dissolute, because furnished with none of the most powerful incentives to moral rectitude,—animated by no patriotic sympathy for a country, in which it feels itself oppressed, and requiring for its special government a system of laws, adapted to its moral and political degradation." To the removal of this population, in a mode consistent alike with patriotism and humanity, the powers and resources of the nation are fully adequate; and it is now submitted in sober seriousness, to the country, whether it would be better to fold our arms under the rapid accumulation of the evil, or to apply ourselves at once to guard against its future and inevitable consequences?

In relation "to the tenure of Southern slavery," the views of the Colonization Society are clear and explicit. A very large proportion of the most active members of the Society are slave-holders. They know and feel, in their fullest extent, the rights that have been secured to them by the Constitution and laws of their country; and they recognize no authority on the part of others to interfere with those rights, or, in any manner, to weaken or destroy the obligations they create. But experience has forced upon them the conviction, that slavery is an absolute evil to this country. They cannot agree with Mr. Secretary Barbour, that it is an evil entailed upon us forever: They believe on the contrary, that its gradual and voluntary removal is fully within

the compass of our means. And they look to the establishment at Liberia as the first, and not the least important step towards the accomplishment of this interesting result. If this "is what is meant" by "the nurture and propagation of principles unfriendly to the tenure of Southern slavery," I for one plead guilty to the charge, even at the risk of encountering "the execration and horror" of the whole race of the Gracchi.* OPIMIUS.

*In his Notes on Virginia, Mr. Jefferson says "with what *execration* should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one-half the citizens to trample on the rights of the other half: transforms those into despots, and these into enemies; destroys the morals of the one part, and the amor patriæ of the other. For if a slave can love a country in this world, it must be any other in preference to that in which he is born to live and labour for another, in which he must lock up all the faculties of his nature, contribute as far as depends on his individual endeavours, to the evanishment of the human race, or entail his miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed, &c.

"And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people, that these liberties are the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just, that his justice cannot sleep forever, that considering numbers, nature, and natural means, only a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events! that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest, &c. But the way, I hope, is preparing under the auspices of Heaven for *a total emancipation*, and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation."

"Ah, what's more dangerous, than this fond affiance.
"Seems he a dove? His feathers are but borrowed.
"Is he a lamb? His skin is surely lent him."—*Shakspeare.*

To the Editors of the Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: I must bespeak the pardon of an intelligent public for again throwing myself upon its indulgence, after the intimation which I gave, of my determination to rely in future upon the good sense of my countrymen, to arrest the further propagation of the pernicious doctrines of the American Colonization Society. But the recent effusions of Opimius, (which I must consider as semi-official,) connected with certain *public resolves* of late by the Society, force me from my purpose, and demand a further notice. And while I have no doubt, but the interests of the Society would

be best consulted, by diverting the public attention from the real objects of the Institution, to little petty personalities which have no connection with the subject under discussion; I shall take care, that your correspondent and his Society, do not escape by any artifice of that kind; although it is possible, even in that species of warfare, Opimius might find himself in many respects uncomfortable. And I will now only say to him, that I am perfectly aware, that in *his* estimation I have sinned beyond forgiveness, in daring to question the infallibility of his club, and that like many of the ancient reformers, I shall be able only to expiate my offence at the stake, or upon the scaffold. I have, too, in a most unpardonable manner, been guilty of betraying this *once good-natured* and *courteous* gentleman, into an utter loss, both of his temper and good manners. And, above all, have so far taken advantage of his weakness, as to drive this selected champion and Vice-President of the Colonization Society into an unqualified declaration, that his Society "*looks to their establishment at Liberia as the first, and not the least important step,*" to effect the entire removal of our slave population. And this, too, almost at the same moment that a worthy member, (with whom I presume Opimius is very well acquainted) for the purpose of quieting public alarm, is moving a string of resolutions before the parent Society, declaring to the world, among other things, "that its *only object* is the removal to the coast of Africa, with their own consent, of such people of colour, within the United States, as are already free, and of such others as the humanity of individuals and the laws of the different States may hereafter liberate." But this is not all: these high offences have been greatly aggravated by the fact, that they have all been committed by an arch "County Court Advocate," and "your errant pupil, Messrs. Editors." Without venturing, in any degree, to question either the candour or morality of this course, according to the standard which the Society may have erected; I would respectfully intimate to your correspondent, that if this is a specimen, I can have as little fancy for his system of ethics, as I have for his politics; and which, he must pardon me for saying, would be esteemed entirely too Jesuitical, to pass as current coin, even among the most subordinate of that profession, which he has chosen to deride. Let us, however, forego for the present, any consideration of this act of *good faith* to the public, which a religious and philanthropic Association has been pleased to exercise; and superadd some further reflections on that

ground of hope, which the Society has solemnly declared to the world was its only anchor of salvation. I mean the powers of the Federal Government to interfere in its behalf, and to take the Society and its new Colony into their own hands. And to enable the country to take a just and satisfactory view of this question, it is peculiarly proper that the *real objects* of the Society, stripped and unmasked of all its false habiliments, should be taken into the estimate. And while I have been heretofore labouring to collect the scattered and latest evidences of the Society's purpose to effect the general emancipation of slavery by indirect means, this Vice-President of the Institution, under his newspaper signature, (no doubt in a moment of weakness and melting pity for all Africa) has told the whole tale. I shall, therefore, on the present occasion, consider him as good authority for the fact, that the Society "looks to their establishment at Liberia *as the first, and not the least important step*" to the attainment of this object. How, then, does the question fairly present itself? The American Colonization Society professing, by its public resolves, that its *only object* is the colonization of the free people of colour on the coast of Africa; while one of its Vice-Presidents, an active defender in the public prints, backed by a public journal, styled "The African Repository," created by its bounty, and exclusively devoted to its service, is industriously engaged in inculcating the opinion, that negro slavery is the greatest social and political curse of our country, and that its removal is indispensable to our future safety and happiness.* With this double-faced, Janus-like aspect, being "neither fish nor fowl," it presents itself before the American Congress, and begs to be adopted as a legitimate subject of its bounty, and a child of the Constitution. And the question is again emphatically asked, under what provision of the Constitution is it, that this application is made? We are told by Opimius, according to his explanation now given, that it is under the *implied* power of Congress to appropriate the public revenue to objects connected with the "domestic tranquillity, the common defence and general welfare," as indicated in the preamble to the Constitution. And without settling the question between us, whether the fault was with him, in the statement of his proposition, or myself in misapprehending it, I am willing now to consider this to have been his ori-

* See, in particular, the conclusion of the 3d No. of Opimius, first series of publications, in reply to Caius Gracchus, and the whole character of the publications of "The African Repository" upon the subject of slavery.

ginal meaning: And still I must deny, that this new doctrine of "the appropriating power" of the Government. "has been conceded by a large proportion of the wisest and best men of our country, and been sustained by the uniform practice of every administration from the first to the last." But, on the contrary, think I shall be able to show by an application of it, to some of Opimius's own examples, that in its practical operations it would fall but little short of the doctrine, that the "*General Government might do whatever it believed would* be conducive to the common defence and general welfare," or, in other words, whatever it pleased: and that it is a heresy, which can in no degree be reconciled with the idea, that the Federal Government is one of limited powers.

But before I proceed to test the orthodoxy of this new doctrine, derived from the fiscal powers of the Government, I will succinctly state its history as far as I am informed upon the subject, (though I certainly cannot hope to enlighten your correspondent upon this point.) This doctrine, which is but a modification of the more extravagant one of the "common defence and general welfare," was, I believe, for the first time asserted by any officer of the Government in 1791: and then by Col. Hamilton, in his Report upon the subject of manufactures. The notion at that time was considered as extravagant, and although a Federal Administration was then in full exercise of power, Congress passed no law founded upon the Report, nor did any other act in relation to it, which could be construed into a recognition of its correctness. The doctrine seems to have slept from that time up to the period of Mr. Monroe's administration, when after nearly thirty years repose, it is again asserted by Mr. Calhoun in his Report in 1819, (according to my present recollection.) upon the subject of Roads and Canals, with an eye to military operations, and in 1822, is again declared by Mr. Monroe, in his most elaborate essay upon the Constitutional powers of Congress to execute a general system of Internal Improvement; and finally in 1824, when the bill for obtaining the necessary surveys, preparatory to a general system of Internal Improvement was under discussion, it is believed that Mr. McDuffie was the only gentleman in the whole debate, who contended for it, while every other gentleman who noticed the doctrine at all (as far as I have seen the debates) whether advocates or opponents of the bill, expressly renounced it, as a doctrine which in its practical operations, would utterly destroy the Federal Government, as one of

limited powers. It is true that Mr. Adams goes the whole; as well in relation to this, as to many other newly discovered powers of the Government. And it is more than probable, that Mr. Monroe is indebted to his ministry for his latter impressions upon this subject, which he himself, at the very moment of announcing them to the world, admitted he did not entertain for the first twenty or thirty years of his political life; and which he was certainly not suspected of carrying with him into the Presidential Chair. That Messrs. Lowndes and Cheves ever advocated this doctrine, is a fact, of which I am not informed; and about which, your correspondent with all his zeal and devotion to it, is not himself certainly advised. This then, is a history, according to my information, of this doctrine of the "appropriating power" of the Government: and which I hazard nothing in repeating, was never considered as a *settled article* of the ancient Federal creed: The true battle-ground, between the old Federal and Democratic parties, being as to the *extent* of the *incidental powers* of the Government, as your correspondent himself intimates, and which may be abundantly seen, by reference to the debates upon the United States Bank bill of 1790, and more especially the opinions of Messrs. Jefferson and Hamilton, communicated, in cabinet council, to General Washington upon that question; and which, with the various other debates and readings upon the Constitution, of that period, I would advise Opimius again to peruse, if he has not abandoned his political catechism, and become as excessive in his politics, as his Society has in the pursuit of its objects.

But it is admitted by your correspondent that this is an *implied* power, and to be found nowhere expressed in the Constitution. Also, that the objection urged by Mr. Madison in his Report of 1799, grounded on the quality of money as an almost universal agent, for effecting every object of legislation, would be a solid one; as it would have the effect of defeating the subsequent enumeration of powers in the Constitution, "if the power to *appropriate money* to an object drew after it, as a necessary consequence, the power to *accomplish* that object:" "the power to appropriate money to an object and the power *to execute it*, being two distinct things." The latter he is pleased to call the *active power* of the Government, and the former, I presume, when christened, he would have us to understand as the *passive* power. And finally, by way of illustration, puts two cases: The one is "Mr. King's proposition to create a fund to aid in the eman-

cipation and removal of such slaves as may, by the laws of the several States, be authorized to be emancipated and removed," which he says "could in no possible mode interfere with the rights, either of the States, or of individuals. But a power to emancipate and remove the slaves within the limits of a State, would be a most alarming power of interference with both."

Let us now, Messrs. Editors, for the double purpose of illustrating this new doctrine, as well as of estimating the true character of this insidious proposition, which has been so eagerly embraced and defended by your correspondent and his Society, give it a practical application to this subject of negro slavery. It is admitted, that the tenure by which we hold this portion of our property is sacred and inviolable under the Constitution; and that a power on the part of the Federal Government "to emancipate and remove the slaves within the limits of a State, would be a most alarming power of interference, both with the rights of the States and of individuals." Let us suppose that Congress, in the exercise of its power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, &c." should decide, that the general welfare demanded the removal of the whole slave population of the South, and that a tariff of duties should be so conceived and planned, as to bear almost exclusively upon the interest of the slave-holding States, (and recent experience shows the practicability of this part of the scheme,) with a view of raising a revenue to be applied to this object; and out of this fund to appropriate a sum to be laid out in the purchase of slaves, at a price that could not fail to command them, say $1000 for each slave, young or old, male or female, to be delivered to its agents throughout the country, for the purpose of emancipation and removal. Can any reasonable man doubt, but this would be as effectual a mode of *accomplishing* the emancipation of our slaves, at our own cost too, as any direct exercise of power for that object? In the one case, the operation would be direct and immediate; in the other, indirect in its operation, employing only a little contrivance to wring from us the very money, which is afterwards to be re-delivered to us in payment for our own property; and all this for "the common defence and general welfare."

Let it be also remembered, that according to Opimius's own theory, the *validity* of this power is made to depend on its capacity to *accomplish* its object: Because, in his own language, if the "appropriation of money to an object draws

after it the power to accomplish that object," it is equivalent to a direct exercise of the *active powers* of the Government to the attainment of that end.

In the case under consideration, it has never been doubted by any one, but the power to emancipate the slaves of a State was exclusively a State right. Suppose the State of Virginia to be as unanimous in her legislative resolves to retain her slave population, as she has shown herself to be opposed to a Federal system of Internal Improvement; of what avail would be this legislative resolve, this State purpose, when the Federal Government had the power of compelling us to contribute the very funds with which, by its agents, it was buying up from individuals all the slaves of the commonwealth, at a price of three or four times their real value? The appropriations cannot here be said to go in *aid* of the rights and policy of the State of Virginia, but directly in opposition to it. Its operation is directly and immediately upon the citizens of the commonwealth, and their property; without the intervention of State consent or State legislation. And it is not a sufficient answer to this objection to allege, that in this mode of operation, the consent of the individual slave holders must first be obtained: Because it is this very circumstance of the Federal Government being able to *accomplish* its object, independent of State legislation or consent, by directly operating upon the citizens of the States, (who are also citizens of the United States,) that makes the proceeding equivalent to a direct exercise of its *active powers.*

What then becomes, Messrs. Editors, of this fanciful notion of the *active* and *passive* powers of the Federal Government, when it is reduced to practice? Money, from its capacity of almost universal application to human affairs, and its powerful efficiency in *accomplishing* every object to which it is applied, must be admitted to be the most powerful of all human means in legislation; and under our Government, I hazard but little in saying, considered as a mean, is more efficient and powerful than all the other means of the Constitution put together, either granted in, or implied from, that instrument. Yet this master-power of the Constitution—this "lever of Archimedes," capable of oversetting the whole fabric of a limited Government, was left by the wise framers of the Constitution to implication merely; and to be tortured by worse than "county court ingenuity" from the fiscal powers of the Government.

For the purpose of still further illustrating this subject,

suppose the Federal Government to determine "to emancipate and remove the slaves within the limits of a State," by an exercise of its active powers; and for that purpose, we will suppose this power to be given them directly in the Constitution. How would the Government proceed to effect this object? According to a provision in the 5th amendment to the Constitution, it could only be done by paying to their owners a fair price; for, that amendment expressly provides, "that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation." Here then it is apparent, that whether the thing is to be done directly, and by means of its *active* powers, as they have been called, or indirectly by the "appropriating power," the result is fully much the same. The people in both cases are to be paid for their property, and the slaves of a State emancipated without an act of State legislation; and the only circumstance of difference is, that, by means of the appropriating power, Congress *accomplishes* by indirect means what it is conceded on all hands it cannot effect directly, without a violation of the Constitution. Let it also be remembered, that, in this way, by a competent douceur for the purchase and transportation of Southern slaves, the Federal Government is directly interfering with the basis of our Representation in Congress; as each slave, in the apportionment of Federal Representation, counts as three-fifths of a free man.

Thus much, Messrs. Editors, for this doctrine of the appropriating power of the Government, on which this Society, supposing it really to be a Colonization and not an Abolition Society, must rest in its application to Congress for patronage and support. And I have only to regret, that the limits of a newspaper essay forbid my superadding many other views, of which this part of the subject is so susceptible. But I have the consolation to reflect that Virginia has a Tazewell and a Randolph at their posts, who, in concert with the other distinguished sons of the South, will drive this basilisk from the floor of Congress, by the first glance of their withering eloquence: and that, in the appropriate language of the latter gentleman, (not exactly in relation to this Society,) they will readily distinguish between "its language *official* and its language *confidential*," where one thing is said "to the novice, and another to the initiated."

But whether this Society is in reality a Colonization or an Abolition Society, or in fact both, (which last I take to be its real character,) must be settled by its *acts*, and not by its words. And after the proofs which I have heretofore

adduced, I shall now content myself with referring gentlemen who entertain a doubt upon this subject, to the character of its public journal, "The African Repository," and the late publications of Opimius, who, if he has not become weary of his dignity, will be found wearing the toga of a Vice-President (if I am not mistaken) when public resolves are to be moved; and who has recently told us, amid a great deal of scolding at Gracchus, that his "Society looks to their establishment at Liberia as the *first* and not the least important *step*" to effect the total removal of our slave population.

A word or two more, Messrs. Editors, to Opimius at parting, who has been so good as to recommend me, in the character of pupil, to your future ward and guardianship, and for which I must return him my thanks; and should certainly endeavour to requite the favour by looking out for some able master, who would correct his excesses upon the subject of politics, as well as negro slavery, if I did not believe his case to be absolutely hopeless; and, like the renowned Knight of Mancha, who travelled for the purpose of relieving distressed damsels, that nothing short of a *tilt* to Liberia in person, with one summer's sweating in that climate, would be able to tame his spirits and settle his reason.

He has also been polite enough to remind me of the association of "such names as Chief Justice Marshall, Judge Washington. Mr. Clay, and Mr. Crawford," with the operations of his Society, and to tell me, "that I must have established for myself a reputation derived from some other source than the conflicts of a county court," before I can hope to arouse public indignation against men like these. In this he gratuitously ascribes to me a motive which I never entertained: Because it is well known, that the names and titles of many of these "big wigs" are only thrown in by way of make-weight, and are afterwards given to the public, as a gilded bait to the gudgeon. But I felt it a little unkind in your correspondent to have delayed this intimation until I had broken all terms with the Society: for perhaps if given at an earlier period, I, too, might have become a member of this Club, and been able to boast, like Jack Daw, of the richness of my plumage, and the good company I kept.

Permit me now, gentlemen, in conclusion, to say to you, that in every thing which I have ever written or said upon this subject, (and I hope not to be compelled again to trouble you,) I have never allowed myself to question the goodness of the motives which influenced a large majority of the friends of colonization. But the wisdom and policy of their scheme,

I have spoken of with freedom, and denounced in the strongest language at my command. I have even felt disposed to reconcile, what I am bound to consider an uncandid suppression of their ultimate views in relation to our slave population, as a course which they esteemed necessary in order the more effectually and quietly to atchieve what a misguided sensibility taught them to believe would be a great public good. But even fanaticism must remember, that this is a subject around which vipers are strung in every direction; and whether it be assailed in the public prints, or upon the floor of Congress, all the kind feelings of the human heart will be sacrificed to the necessity of the case. For in relation to this subject, it has been wisely said, "that there are some occasions upon which *instinct* is worth all the argument in the world."

CAIUS GRACCHUS.

March 26th, 1826.

To the Editors of the Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: Although I have given no intimation of *my* intention "to rely in future, on the good sense of my countrymen," to sustain the principles I have advocated, against their most persevering assailant, I assure you with the utmost sincerity, that I feel very great reluctance in again trespassing on the public attention. A farmer, dependent for his support on the labour of his slaves, and his own personal exertions, imposes on himself no ordinary task, when he undertakes to combat the quibbles, and expose the sophistry, of one of that description, of "county court advocates," who are *perfectly at leisure* to attend to every body's business but their own. And indeed, after the fearful intimation given me, "that I might possibly find myself in many respects uncomfortable," in a farther "encounter of wits" with your astute correspondent, I should feel constrained to retire from the unequal contest, if I were not deeply impressed with the conviction, that this *modest Malvolio* had mistaken his head for his heart, and given his abilities a credit, which properly belonged to his inclination only. Sensible, too, that his wit, with all the keenness with which his own imagination has invested it, has not yet "borne a heart-stain away on its blade;" I indulge in the humble hope, that it will continue to maintain its harmless and inoffensive character; and in this

hope, venture once more to expose myself, in the cause of truth, to its feeble and random thrusts.

I will not stop to inquire in what school of ethics Caius Gracchus has taken *his* degree; but I must be pardoned for saying, that his moral sense must be sustained very much at the expense of his intelligence, if we are to ascribe exclusively to the defects of the latter, his wretched attempt to fix on the American Colonization Society, the charge of *bad faith* towards the public. The resolution quoted with so much exultation from the late proceedings of the Society, will be found to be in strict accordance, not only with every sentiment it has ever uttered, and every act it has ever done, but with that very declaration, with which it is sought to be exhibited in such glaring contrast.

I have already had occasion, in correcting some of the earlier *mistakes* of Caius Gracchus, to refer to the speeches of Mr. Randolph and Mr. Clay, to show, that at the very commencement of its existence, the Society was looked to, as an instrument for relieving the country, not only of that portion of its coloured population *already free*, but of that portion also, *yet retained in a state of slavery*. On this latter feature of the plan proposed, both the gentlemen dwelt with peculiar emphasis. And, Mr. Randolph in particular, declared his belief, "that there were hundreds, nay, thousands of individuals in the South, prepared to avail themselves of the contemplated settlement, to throw off the evils and the burdens of slavery." Under the same impressions, and in the very same spirit, I ventured to assert in my last number, (only reiterating what I had said in every previous number,) "that the Society looked to its settlement at Liberia, as the first, and not the least important step towards the entire removal of the whole coloured population of the country." And after all the eloquence, and all the ingenuity of the Amelia Advocate, I very cheerfully submit it to the decision of my fellow-citizens, whether there be any thing in the assertion, conflicting in the smallest degree, with the declaration of the Society, "that its *only object* is the removal, to the coast of Africa, with their own consent, of such people of colour, within the United States, as are already free, and *of such others as the humanity of individuals, and the laws of the different States may hereafter liberate?*" Neither my declaration, nor the resolution of the Society proposes any other operation in relation to slavery, but such as may be sanctioned, and indeed, conducted by slave-holders themselves, and the authorities of the slave-holding States: and neither pro-

poses to stop short of this, even though it should ultimately lead, (as it is confidently hoped it may do,) to the entire removal of the whole coloured population of the country.

So much, then, for the *object* of the Colonization Society—an object, (no matter what Caius Gracchus may say to the contrary,) perfectly understood by the public, and I had supposed, intelligible even to the "most subordinate of that profession," with which he has very generously proposed to share the derision intended for himself alone. But I have yet to perform the more arduous duty of examining the new light, which this profound logician, this modern Sir Hudibras, has shed on the constitutional right of Congress, to fulfil the just expectations of the Society and its friends; and in the discharge of this duty, I beg leave, by a fair explanation of the real character and extent of their expectations, to rescue them from the obscurity in which your wily correspondent has, at least, attempted to involve them.

To the authorities of the United States, then, the Society looks, in the first instance, for nothing more than the acquisition and government of a territory, suitable for the reception and maintenance of such portions of the coloured population of our country, as their own inclinations may prompt, the humanity of individuals permit, and the laws of the different States encourage to emigrate. But, as the emigration, proceeding from these different causes, may, (and it is hoped will,) in process of time, require for its support, more abundant resources, than can be supplied, either by individual wealth, or the scanty revenues of the States; and as the object to be effected, (not "*executed,*") is one of general and national concern, resort must, in this case, be had to the *pecuniary aid* of that Government, to which has been confided the important right, "of laying and collecting taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." Such, and such only, is the interference which the Society asks at the hands of the General Government. Every thing else, connected with the colonization of the people of colour, can, and it is believed, will be effected, by individual humanity, and the wisdom of the respective States.

From the silence of Caius Gracchus, in his last number, on the right of the General Government to acquire and "provide the needful rules and regulations" for the government of any territory, demanded by the general interests of the nation, I take it for granted, that his constitutional ob-

jection to its interference, so far, at least, as these powers alone are involved, is abandoned; and that he is prepared to acquiesce in its compliance with the earnest and repeated solicitations of the State of Virginia, for aid in procuring a settlement for her coloured population on the coast of Africa. But, as I anticipated, those unfortunate expressions, "the common defence and general welfare," have produced their wonted excitement, and all the powers of his genius have been exerted, in protecting the people against blessings to be procured by the agency of that portion of their own money, which has passed through the defiled channel of the treasury of the United States.

I very cheerfully yield him all the advantages to be derived from my concession in a former number. I admitted then, and I still admit, that if the power *to appropriate money to an object*, and the power *to effect* that object, were one and the same thing, or that if the former drew the latter after it as a *necessary consequence*, the power of appropriation must, of course, be limited to the *enumerated* powers of the Government, as it would otherwise totally defeat the intention of that enumeration. But it will require other arguments than such as have yet been adduced, to prove that any given effect, which may be constitutionally defeated by a State, or even by an individual, *can be the necessary consequence* of an appropriation on the part of the General Government. And, until this is established, I must be excused for paying so much respect to the fair common-sense meaning of words, and to the received rules of construction, as to think, that a revenue specially raised for "promoting the common defence and general welfare" of the country, may be applied to those purposes, without any reference whatever to a subsequent enumeration of *additional powers* to be exercised by the Government. And I am the more decided in this opinion, from the conviction, that if it be not correct, the people of the United States have been guilty of the extreme folly of defeating the most important end of government, *their own prosperity*, by an injudicious distribution of their powers and resources between their different agents—having given to the General Government abundant resources, which cannot be used for want of objects of appropriation, and to the State Governments, important powers, which cannot be exercised for want of revenue to sustain them. Restore to the State of Virginia, the power "to lay and collect duties, and imposts," within her own limits, and there is no measure connected either with the education of her citizens, the improve-

ment of her roads and canals, or the colonization of her people of colour, that will be beyond the compass of her means. But leave this abundant source of revenue in the hands of the General Government, and shut out by ingeniously contrived constitutional barriers, its rich overflowings, from the channels they would naturally seek, when relieved from the national debt, and our citizens must continue to live in ignorance, our natural resources must be forever neglected, and a mixed population, pregnant with all the evils of *domestic slavery*, must be our endless portion.

In giving a practical illustration of the distinction I had endeavoured to establish between *the right to appropriate* and *the power to execute*, I referred, in a former number, to two cases of appropriation by the General Government, to objects not included in its enumerated powers. Of the first of them, viz. a subscription to a road or a canal, undertaken under the authority of a State Legislature, Caius Gracchus has very prudently taken no note, "letting it go," in the true spirit of Dogberry's philosophy, "and thanking God, he had got rid of a troublesome fellow." It affords, however, too apposite and forcible an exposition of the absurdity of his doctrine, to be kept entirely out of view; and I must accordingly be pardoned for again inviting his attention to it, and again asking him, whether the right to make the appropriation in question, on the ground that it will "promote the common defence and general welfare," draws after it, *as a necessary consequence*, the right to complete the road or the canal, even against the wishes of the State, by whose authority it has been undertaken? If it does not, the power to *appropriate*, and the power to *execute*, are distinct things; and the extension of the former to every measure of general interest, so far from insuring the accomplishment of every object within the range of legislation, is perfectly compatible with the strictest enumeration and limitation of what, I have ventured (very much it seems to the discomfiture of your correspondent,) to demominate "the active powers" of the Government.

My second example, (Mr. King's resolution) has not shared the good fortune of the first. It has encountered all the powers of wit and eloquence, of farce and tragedy, your correspondent could command; and has especially given rise to a series of extravagant "*suppositions*," which would find their most appropriate answer perhaps in the old adage, "if the sky falls, we shall catch larks." The opinion I had expressed on this subject was, "that Mr. King's resolution

for creating a fund to aid in the emancipation and removal of such slaves, *as the laws of the several States permitted to be emancipated and removed*, gave no power to the General Government to act without the consent both of the owners of the slaves and of the States in which they lived; that it did not propose to take from the former a property they wished to retain, nor from the latter a population, they might be unwilling to lose; and that, therefore, it could not in any possible mode, interfere with the rights, either of the States or of individuals." This proposition I had supposed, was too plain to be misunderstood, or "to be tortured by even worse than county court ingenuity," from its fair and obvious import. But strange to tell, by a logic, rivalled only by that which the poet tells us, "could prove by argument, a man's a horse," your correspondent has contrived to deduce from it an uncontrolable power on the part of Congress, to establish an enormous and unequal tariff, to bribe us of the South, into acquiescence, by the trifling offer of one thousand dollars a piece for our slaves, and by the occasional subduction of "three fifths of a freeman," actually to destroy the very basis of our representation in Congress. These it must be confessed, are very appalling considerations; and the apprehensions they had created, have been quieted, only by the recollection, that the *project* which had given rise to them, proposed expressly to limit the contemplated appropriation "to the emancipation and removal of such slaves only, *as the laws of the different States might allow to be emancipated and removed*." To the wisdom and justice of my country, therefore, I am content to look for protection against the threatened tariff. With my fellow-citizens, situated like myself, I am willing to leave the settlement of the terms, on which their negroes shall be sold, no matter who may be the purchaser. And the legislative wisdom of our States, will not (I am sure,) fail to rescue the basis of our representation from destruction, if satisfied by the eloquence of Caius Gracchus, that it is broadest, as well as securest, when resting on a foundation of *human slavery*.

And now, Messrs. Editors, I turn, as in duty bound to the suggestion of your correspondent, not less witty than refined, in relation to "a tilt to Liberia;" and in acceding to his proposition, claim no other privilege than that which the laws of chivalry universally allowed, of indulging my own whim, in the selection of a squire. To whom, then, can I look, or on whom can my choice so appropriately fall as on him, who combining in himself most of the distinguishing

peculiarities of a Sancho and a Ralpho, seems evidently to have been formed by nature for a station.

"That costs no pains,
Of study, industry, or brains?"

When, therefore, I assume the character and equipments of the renowned Knight of La Mancha, I shall expect to find at my heels, in the person of Caius Gracchus, a faithful squire, worthy of his chief and patron. In the mean time, I propose to him in sober seriousness, a temporary suspension of hostilities. His exertions during the last fall, contributed very much as I am informed, to obtain a legislative appropriation of $800 for the Auxiliary Society of Richmond and Manchester. A similar appropriation, at the next session, will most probably be desirable; and I cannot help hoping, that a renewal of his attack, at a period not too remote from the commencement of the session, will have its appropriate effect, and open still wider towards the object of his hostility, the hearts of our legislators, and the purse-strings of the State. OPIMIUS.

A Card to the Editor.

Gentlemen: The argument between Opimius and myself is at an end. His late puerile and fretful rant, equally disarms opposition, and provokes the public derision. By his laboured personalities I am but little moved, as they involve in themselves, equally the proof of his own weakness, and the miserable shifts to which disingenuousness and double-dealing, can fly for refuge in the hour of detection. I should indeed have been sadly ignorant of the human character, had I reckoned, for a moment, that I could assail, with impunity, the principles of a club, founded in mischief, propagated by deception, and impelled to its purpose by all the rage of religious enthusiasm. However misjudging in other respects, in this I have neither been deceived nor disappointed. I early foresaw, that in any attempt to excite reflection on the part of my countrymen, upon the real, though covert objects of the Colonization Society, I should expose myself to every species of personal assault, from the more polished railery of true and genuine wit, down to the lowest Billingsgate, which the most vulgar fancy could invent; and that the muddy streams of obloquy, and the mad ravings of fanaticism, would be equally directed against me.—But I must candidly acknowledge, that I had not counted among the ills of the

enterprise, the peltings of a little mind, whose consequence in no small degree, depended upon the petty dignity of a Vice-Presidency in his own club, and the reputation which his vanity taught him to believe, he could be able to win in a controversy with Caius Gracchus in the public prints, upon his own favourite theme. This portion of suffering, I had not indeed estimated; although I ought to have remembered that in all *those goodly associations*, there are some *little great ones*, who would be entirely overlooked, did they not make up by the excess of their zeal, what never could be expected from the wisdom of their acts. Ought I not then, gentlemen, to regard the *dreadful* assault, which has been recently made upon me by this most *puissant*, and *tolerant little dignitary*, quite as an incident in the course of events—and which in his own words, if it

> "*Costs no pains*
> "*Of study, industry, or brains,*"

is at least indicative of that angry spirit of intolerance, which never fails to result from, and is the legitimate offspring of every connection between religion and politics.

Your correspondent, it would seem, unable to brook the freedom of discussion, has fallen into a passion, and called Gracchus by sundry hard names, (such as "modest Malvolio," &c.) and has been cruel enough, to deny him even a moderate share of intelligence; and this, too, at the expense of his own consistency; for, when in a better mood, he imputed to him both ingenuity and learning, to neither of which had he any serious claim. Hence, Messrs. Editors, if the public should manifest any indifference either to his censures or his praise, you will impute it to the proper cause, and agree with all sensible men, that opinions which are so dependent upon the humours, are not worth regarding. I will, however, on my part, in passing judgment upon him, endeavour to avoid his example, and at least preserve consistency and candour; and in good faith acknowledge, that his earlier publications were in no degree discreditable to him as an author; but that in the language of King Richard he may justly say:

> "*I can play the Orator, as well as Nestor,*
> "*Deceive more slyly than Ulysses could,*
> "*Change forms with Proteus for advantage,*
> "*And set the murderous Machiavel to school.*"

And I will furthermore do him the justice to believe, that in the Philosophy of his favourite "Dogberry," he is himself altogether an adept. For, even if he should be so unfortunate as to "take note" of a troublesome fact or proposition,

he feels no difficulty in abandoning it so abruptly, that the most charitable of his readers must consider it an absolute case of desertion, and his remarks as any thing but an argument. And hence it is, that the principles of his art, no doubt taught him "to submit it cheerfully to the decision of his fellow-citizens," whether his Society were guilty of an act of bad faith, in making a solemn and public declaration, that its objects were confined to the removal of the free people of colour only, while its most active partizans, and one of *its Vice-Presidents*, aided by a monthly Journal, were sedulously engaged in inveighing against negro slavery, and pointing "to their Colony at Liberia, as the first, and not the least important step" to the removal of our whole slave population. Your correspondent must pardon me also, for considering him as obviously invoking the public sympathy, and the compliments of his Society, when he tells us "that a farmer dependent for his support on the labour of his slaves, and his own personal exertions, imposes on himself no ordinary task, when he undertakes to combat the quibbles, and expose the sophistry of one of that description, of county court advocates, who are perfectly at leisure to attend to every body's business but their own." And while I should certainly feel a sentiment of humility, could I envy him either the one or the other; a moderate share of observation might have taught him, that the irregular intervals themselves, at which the communications of Gracchus have appeared, were the result of other engagements. At the same time I cannot forbear the belief myself, that your correspondent is a gentleman *entirely at leisure*. And it is perhaps, owing to this excess of leisure, and a little troublesome vanity which is known to beset him, that we are to ascribe the many busy hours that we find him killing, in the pursuit of mischief, and the duties pertaining to his petty dignity.

But I must not forget, gentlemen, that I am sending you merely a card, designed to apprise Opimius that if he is really desirous of a *Truce*, he must not expect to "fret his busy hour," and then extend the olive branch; but in good faith, *act* upon the principle which he recommends, and he will find me in that case as little disposed to trouble the public with a controversy, in which they have ceased to have an interest, as I shall be at all times explicit, in retaliating every thing that savours of personality.

CAIUS GRACCHUS.

June 30th, 1826.

To the Editors of the Enquirer.

GENTLEMEN: I have no disposition to pursue the controversy with Caius Gracchus any farther. The argument between us, is at an end—and might indeed very fairly have terminated at an earlier period. But his gross perversions of my original argument rendered explanations necessary—and if in making *them*, I have ventured to apply a suitable corrective to overweening arrogance, I find my justification not less in the offence to be punished than in the spirit in which my earlier forbearance was met. Like the old man in the fable, I have resorted to stones, only when simpler weapons had failed in their effect. And if Caius Gracchus is now smarting under their operation, he must blame, not the instruments of his correction, but the vanity which exposed him to their peltings.

Before venturing to complain of "laboured personalities," or representing them as "the shifts of disingenuousness and double-dealing," he ought, in common prudence, to have adverted to the fact, that it was himself who first attempted to divert the public mind from the subject in discussion, to the person and character of his opponent; and if he had not been permitted to assail with impunity, the principles, of what he is pleased to designate as "a club," he must recollect that his investigation of those principles was combined, from the beginning, with an indecorous attack on the integrity and fair dealing of their supporters, and with a wretched attempt to draw down "the execration and horror" of the community, on a very respectable portion of his fellow-citizens.

How far I have been stimulated to the defence, in which I have engaged, either by "religious enthusiasm," or by "the little troublesome vanity which is known to beset me," I must leave to the judgment of others. I cannot help hoping, however, that in selecting motives of action for me, my opponent, (with whom I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance,) has relied on the suggestions of his own exuberant fancy, rather than on the information of others. And I feel perfectly assured that an intelligent public will, at all events, visit with a spirit of indulgence, "a vanity," so "little," as to aspire only to a reputation "*to be won in a controversy with Caius Gracchus in the public prints*"!!!

I have not been guilty of the inconsistency charged upon me. It is very possible that "in imputing to him, at first, both ingenuity and learning," I might (as was intimated to me, by a very respectable neighbour of his, and is now con-

firmed by his own declaration,) have done him more than justice. But as these were not wholly incompatible with inordinate vanity, and presumptuous arrogance, I have not felt myself debarred by early and (as it would seem) unmerited praise, from applying the lash of ridicule to pretensions, evidently beyond the reach of argument or advice; and if my respect even for his "ingenuity and learning," has undergone a considerable diminution, that public to which he appeals, will attribute it, (I am sure,) not so much to any "varying humours" of *mine*, as to the obvious intellectual descent, which has marked *his* latter progress.

But it is not my wish to be unjust. Caius Gracchus has talents and learning amply sufficient for the sphere in which he was designed to move. An ingenuity less brilliant, an education less polished, and a facility of expression less happy, than have fallen to his lot, might make a very respectable figure before an ordinary jury. These qualifications, (aided, as they will be, by a spirit of self-complacency, that can conceive no higher motive of action, than "a reputation to be won in a controversy with Caius Gracchus,") may very possibly fit him for the new theatre on which he is about to act. They may even make him *something*, in a body, where, (as I once heard Mr. Randolph say in reference to a similar body,) "a cypher does not always pass for nought." But they have not qualified him to become a public instructor, and if the "cacoethes scribendi" has acquired a hold upon him absolutely irresistible, I trust he will, at least, select, in future, some other objects of attack, than the benevolent institutions, and the religious feelings of the community in which he lives. OPIMIUS.

Fairfax County, August 8th, 1826.